

No. 30—VILASA GRANT OF PROLAYA-NAYAKA

(1 Plate)

N. VENKATARAMANAYYA AND M. SOMASEKHARA SARMA, MADRAS

This grant was originally discovered long ago, nearly a century back, in the village of Kandarāda, near Pithapuram in the East Godavari District, by Sri Hundi Venkata Rao Pantulu Garu. He and his partner in business, a Vaiśya whose name is said to have been forgotten, heard a metallic sound one morning while digging the earth for a brick-kiln of joint enterprise, when they further dug deep having been curious to know the cause of that sound. Then they found fourteen copper plates attached to a ring. Since it was a joint enterprise Sri Venkata Rao and his Vaiśya partner both divided this new property equally between themselves, and got seven plates each. The ring also went to the share of the Vaiśya partner who had copper vessels made out of the plates and the ring. The plates which went to the share of Sri Venkata Rao were preserved in his family with superstitious care as a unique treasure. Two generations after, their existence was revealed to Sri Sabnavis Satyakesava Rao Pantulu Garu, a public worker and scholar of repute, who was connected with that family by marital ties, and who, being educated in English, knew the value of copper-plate grants in general to history. Much interested in history, he made the discovery public, and was curious to know the contents of the plates. Some two decades back, when Sri M. Somasekhara Sarma, one of the editors of the grant under study, had gone to Visakhapatnam, Sri Hundi Venkata Rao Pantulu, the owner of the plates and the great grandson of their original discoverer, was good enough to place them in the hands of Sri Sarma for decipherment and publication.¹ Sri Somasekhara Sarma takes this opportunity to convey his grateful thanks to all those concerned for placing this record in his hands. The inscription is very valuable specially for the history of the Āndhras, and throws a flood of light on the political conditions of the Āndhra country subsequent to the fall of Warangal in 1323 A. D. The plates are now preserved in the Government Museum, Madras. It is fortunate that the seven plates that went to the share of Sri Venkata Rao Pantulu Garu, record a grant complete in itself, as the other seven plates probably do another one, and that these plates of one grant had not got mixed up with those of the other.

When these plates were with Sri Somasekhara Sarma they were sent to the Assistant Superintendent for Epigraphy for being reviewed in his Annual Report. This set is marked as No. 5 of Appendix A in the Report for 1938-39 and finds a comprehensive notice in Part II. The inscription on the plates is now edited with the help of a set of excellent inked impressions, kindly placed at the disposal of the editors by Sri N. Lakshminarayan Rao, retired Government Epigraphist for India.

The following is an extract from the description of the plates given in the Annual Report :—

“This is a set of seven thick copper-plates the first and last of which are slightly bigger than the others measuring about 10½” long by 4¾” broad, while the others (plates 2 to 5) measure about 9½” by 4½”. Their writing, which is engraved on the inner side of the 1st plate and on both sides of the other six, is well preserved and protected by broad and raised rims covering their

¹ The following friends, the late lamented patriot and scholar, Sri Marepalli Ramachandra Kavi Garu, President of the Kavita Samiti, Visakhapatnam, Sri Gobburi Venkatananda Raghava Rao Pantulu Garu, whose researches in Hindu astronomical lore are very widely known throughout the Āndhra country and the young poet and enthusiast, Sri Puripanda Appalaswami Garu, Secretary of the above mentioned Samiti, all of whom were interested in having this charter published, deserve mention in this connection. See *Bharat*, Vol. XIX, pp. 307 ff.

edges on three sides, while the right margin is left plain. This rim is about $\frac{3}{16}$ " broad and is also as much in thickness. The plates are numbered in serial order on their inner sides in the breadth of this rim. They have ring holes about $\frac{3}{4}$ " in diameter near their left margin but the ring which must have passed through them and held them together is now missing. The plates weigh 510 *tolas*. In the right margin of the 2nd and 4th plates there is a slight knob-like projection, the purpose of which is not clear."

The inscription on the plates is neatly executed and is in a good state of preservation. The letters, almost all of which attained their modern forms by the date of this record, are deeply inscribed and are very beautiful. Very rarely do we come across such specimen of handsome Telugu writing in the grants issued in the early post-Kākatīya period. The script is **Telugu** which was current in the first half of the fourteenth century A. D. in the Āndhra country and is akin to that found in the Dōnepūṇḍi grant of Nāmaya-nāyaka.¹

No distinction is made between the vowels short and long *e* (ll. 118, 125 and 126), the letters *bā* and *bhā*, *ḍ* and *ḍh*, and the secondary forms of the vowels *e* and *ē* and *o* and *ō*. The sign for the aspirate, seen in the grant in a few cases in *ḍha*, *pha* and *bha*, resembles a small inverted crescent attached below the right arm of the letter. It definitely came into use by the first quarter of the thirteenth century. It can clearly be seen in *ratna-garbhāyāḥ* (1.8), *°bhīdā vibhinnair°*, and *vibhaktē* (1. 11), *°lābhē* (1. 33), *°phalaiḥ* (1.60), *°prauḍha* (1. 117), etc. This, however, is not always used uniformly. The remaining aspirated letters have quite distinct forms to differentiate them from their unaspirated counterparts. Superscript *r*, resembling the modern *avagraha* in a diagonal position, is attached at the right top of the letter. The final forms of *t* and *n* occur frequently, as in ll. 30, 32 and 33. In almost all cases the *anusvāra* has taken the place of final *m*. The only letters in the record that differ from those of the present day are *ṭ*, *d*, *ḍh*, *ś* and *ḷ*. The only difference between *ṭ* and *d* lies in the top stroke. The letter *d* exactly resembles *ḍ* of the present day, but without the loop inside in the right arm and *ḍh* resembles the present day *d*. *N* can easily be identified even though it differs slightly from its present form. Among orthographical peculiarities, a superfluous *anusvāra* is sometimes inserted before double *n*, or before *n* followed by a consonant as in *°rumnnata* (1.61), *Pumnnny=ādhyāpaka* (1.132), *īśāṁnyā°* (1.151, 155); *dḍh* is written instead of *ḍḍh* if the letter *ḍh* is doubled after *r* (ll. 70, 140, 141, and 144); the consonants, *g*, *ch*, *j*, *n*, *t* and *d* sometimes and *y* invariably are doubled after *r*; the palatal *ś* is often used in the names of the donees for the dental *s* as in *Śiddhaya* (1. 110), *Śimgaya* (1. 117) and so on.

The **language** of the inscription is Sanskrit with the exception of the passage in Telugu describing the boundaries of the village granted. The language, excepting the passage describing the boundaries, is chaste and is entirely in verse. This is a beautiful inscriptional *kāvya* in Sanskrit, replete with *alamkāras*, the like of which is rarely seen in the grants of the medieval period. Unfortunately the name of the composer is not given. Another noteworthy feature of this grant is the absence in it of the usual imprecatory verses that are generally found at the close of the inscriptions. The inscription ends with the signature of the donor which reads as *Prōlā-nēni vrālu* (the signature of Prōlā-nēḍu).

The passage describing the boundaries is shabbily inscribed, quite in contrast with the preceding Sanskrit part. The Telugu forms *kāli* and *kāluva* are both used to denote a canal; of these the former form has gone out of use now. *Kroppum-gāluva* (1. 147) means a canal that was dug. This is a compound of *krochchu* and *kāluva*, of which the former is a verbal adjective. *Krochchu* is the root. It means 'to make a low depression, to dig with an iron crow-bar or other instru-

¹ Above, Vol. IV, pp. 356 ff.

ment'. This expression is also used in inscriptions in the sense of inscribing. *Kara* (l. 149, 154, 155) means an earthen bank. The form *imchika* (l. 147) meaning a little, is obviously the older form of *imchuka*. The expression *avuru-bāḍe* (l. 151) is really made up of two words *avuru* and *pāḍe*. The latter means 'a swamp or marsh'. *Avuru-bāḍe* is a compound of *avuru*, (a kind of grass) and *pāḍe*. In the passage *mūṇḍ-ūḷḷa-muttala-Māṅgāpu-puṇṭa* (l. 157) *muttala* is a compound of *mūḍu* and *tala*; *mūṇḍ-ūḷḷa-muttala* means at the junction of the three villages. *Māṅgāpu-puṇṭa* is the narrow way (*puṇṭa*) belonging to the village of *Māṅgām*, the present Māgam, a boundary village.

The inscription begins with the invocation of the god Vishṇu and his Varāha incarnation (ll. 1-4). This is followed by an account of the creation. It is stated that at first the whole world was submerged under waters; that on perceiving this, the god Nārāyaṇa, assuming the form of Brahmā, created all the worlds, in the midst of which was the earth adorned by the Golden Mountain and surrounded by the islands and the seas; that in the centre of the earth and encircled by the salt seas was the Jambūdvīpa divided into nine *khaṇḍas* or continents, of which that extending from the Himalayas to the Southern Ocean was known as Bhārata-varsha comprising many countries, where different languages and customs prevailed; and that one of them named Tiliṅga, through which flowed many holy rivers, contained several rich towns and cities, beautiful mountains, impenetrable forests, deep tanks, and unassailable fortresses (ll. 4-13).

Several kings of both the Solar and Lunar families held sway over this country extending from the sea, without swerving from the path of righteousness. During the Kali Age, the kings of the Kākati family ruled over Tiliṅga from their capital Ēkaśilā, like the Ikshvākus from Ayōdhyā. When several rulers of the dynasty passed away, Pratāparudra, a monarch famous for his prowess ascended the throne and ruled the country with truth and justice so that such famous monarchs of yore as Yayāti, Nābhāga and Bhagīratha were completely forgotten. While king Pratāparudra was ruling the kingdom in this manner, bitter hostility arose between him and Ahammada Suratrāṇa, the lord of the Turushkas. The Suratrāṇa, who was the Yama (Death) to the kings, stamped out the remnants of the royal families left undestroyed by Jāmadagnya (Paraśurāma). Although Pratāparudra vanquished that Suratrāṇa who had an army of 900,000 horses seven times, he had to submit to that Turushka at last, despite his military strength, and unrivalled skill in diplomacy, owing to the decrease of the good fortunes of the people of the earth. While being carried away as a prisoner by the Turushka monarch to his capital Delhi, Pratāparudra departed, by the decree of the Providence, to the world of the gods on the banks of the river Sōmōdbhavā, i.e. Narmadā (ll. 13-28). When the sun, viz. Pratāparudra, set, the world was enveloped in the Turushka darkness. The evil (*adharmā*), which he had up to that time kept under check, flourished under them, as the conditions were very favourable for its growth. The cruel wretches subjected the rich to torture for the sake of their wealth. Many of their victims died of terror at the very sight of their vicious countenances; the Brāhmaṇas were compelled to abandon their religious practices; the images of the gods were overturned and broken; the *agrahāras* of the learned were confiscated; the cultivators were despoiled of the fruits of their labour, and their families were impoverished and ruined. None dared to lay claim to anything, whether it was a piece of property or one's own wife. To those despicable wretches wine was the ordinary drink, beef the staple food, and the slaying of the Brāhmaṇas the favourite pastime. The land of Tiliṅga, left without a protector, suffered destruction from the Yavanas like a forest subjected to devastating wild fire (ll. 28-39). Then was born, as if an *aṁśa* of the god Vishṇu, who took pity on the sufferings of the people, had descended from heaven, king Prōla of the Musunūri family of the fourth caste, who assumed the sovereignty of the earth. He destroyed the power of the Yavanas, who abandoned their forts and fled to unknown places unable to resist his might. The very people who suffered at the hands of the Yavanas sought protection under him, and turned against them

and put them to death. Having overcome the Yavanas in this fashion, he restored to Brāhmaṇas their ancient *agrahāras* confiscated by them, and revived the performance of the sacrifices, the smoke issuing from the firepits of which spreading over the countryside cleaned it of the pollution caused by the movements of those evil-doers. The agriculturists surrendered willingly a sixth of the produce of the soil to the king ; and he set his hand to the task of repairing the damages caused by the Pāraśīkas. King Prōla established himself at Rēkapalli on the Gōdāvarī at the foot of the Mālyavanta mountain ; and having entrusted the administration to his younger brothers such as Kāpaya-nāyaka, he devoted himself to the performance of charitable and meritorious deeds. He granted many *agrahāras* and large sums of money to deserving scholars (11. 39-78). In the *gōtra* of the famous sage Bhāradvāja was born a Brāhmaṇa scholar of the name of Annaya, son of Vennaya, and grandson of Annaya, devoted to the study of the *Yajurveda*. He had two sons, Vennaya and Gaṇapaya, who were distinguished by their learning, lofty character, wealth and liberality. Considering that of the two brothers, the former was worthy of honour, Prōlaya-nāyaka requested him to accept the gift of an *agrahāra*. Vennaya who was accustomed to make gifts rather than take them complied with the king's request somewhat reluctantly (11. 78-98). King Prōlaya granted to Vennaya on the occasion of a lunar eclipse the fertile village of Vilasa in Kōna-maṇḍala which lay on the bank of the Gōdāvarī as an *agrahāra*. Having divided it into one hundred and eight shares, Vennaya changed its name into Prōlavaram after king Prōlaya-nāyaka and gave it in turn to several learned Brāhmaṇas of good lineage and excellent character, proficient in the *śāstras* and the *vēdas*, with all the rights of possession, enjoyment, etc. (11. 98-105). There were in all 82 donees including the two deities Gautamēśvara and Kēśava of the village. The names of the donees and the distribution of shares among them are given in a table in the sequel.

The charter under review throws a flood of light on the history of Āndhra in the years immediately following the Muslim conquest and the downfall of the Kākatīya dynasty. While describing the circumstances in which the gift registered in the charter came to be made, the political changes through which the country had just then passed are briefly recounted. The following points which are therein touched upon call for a few words of elucidation :—(1) The history of Pratāparudra, his enmity with Ahammadu Suratrāṇa of Delhi, his early victories over the Muhammadans, and his ultimate defeat, captivity and death ; (2) the character of the Muslim rule, (3) the rise of the Musunūri family and the formation of the Confederacy of Āndhra *Nāyakas* under the leadership of Prōlaya-nāyaka ; (4) the conquest of Tilinga by Prōlaya-nāyaka and the re-establishment of the Hindu *dharma* ; and (5) his benefactions, especially the gift of the village of Vilasa in Kōna-maṇḍala to the Brāhmaṇa scholar Vennaya of the Bhāradvāja *gōtra*.

The problem that deserves consideration first is the hostility between Pratāparudra and Ahammadu Suratrāṇa, the lord of the Turushkas, who is described as the *laya-kāla* (death) of kings and the destroyer of the remnants of the royal families that were left undestroyed by Jāmadagnya (Paraśurāma). The identity of Ahammadu Suratrāṇa is not difficult to discover ; for, his final victory over Pratāparudra whom he despatched to Delhi as a prisoner and the latter's death on the way to the imperial capital clearly show that he could have been none other than Muḥammad Bin Tughluq. Therefore, it is not unreasonable to assume that Ahammadu is a mistake for Muḥammad due either to the remissness of the engraver, or to the confusion in the mind of the composer of the inscription himself.¹ The statement that Sultān Muḥammad suffered defeat no less than seven times at the hands of Pratāparudra before he could ultimately vanquish him furnishes interesting information on the history of Muslim invasions of Tiling and demands careful examination. The Muslim histories of the period refer to a number of expeditions, which the

¹ A similar mistake is found in a Sanskrit work of a miscellaneous character called the *Prasāngaratnāvali* composed in 1465 A. D. (Madras Government Or. Mss. Lib. 5.5.6, D. No. 12033).

Sultāns of Delhi despatched against Tiling. According to Baranī, Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn Khālī planned an invasion of Tiling as early as 1301 A. D. 'Four or five months after the Sultān left Rantambhōr', says he, 'Ulugh Khān collected a large force with the intention of attacking Tiling and Ma'abar, but his time was come, and the angel of destiny took him to the blessed city. His corpse was conveyed to Delhi and buried in his own house'.¹ The expedition to Tiling did not obviously proceed. The idea was not, however, abandoned. Some two years later, 'at the time when the Sultān was engaged in the siege of Chitor, Malik Fakhr-ud-dīn Jūna, *dadbak-i-Hazarat* and Malik Jhāju of Karra, nephew of Nuṣrat Khān, had been sent with all the forces of Hindustan against Arangal'. On their arrival there the rainy season began and proved such a hindrance that the army could do nothing and in the beginning of the winter returned, greatly reduced in numbers, to Hindustan.² The expedition thus ended in disaster. Although the Muslim historians attribute the failure to the outbreak of rains, it is not unlikely that they came into conflict with the Tilingas and were worsted by them in the fight.

The failure of the expedition rankled in the mind of 'Alā-ud-dīn; and in 1309-10 A. D., he despatched another expedition under the famous Malik Nā'ib Kāfūr and Khawāja Hājī, the '*āriz-i-Mamālik*. This expedition, according to the unanimous testimony of Muslim historians, was a resounding success of Muslim arms. The details of it are far too well known to need description. The Muslim armies marched to Warangal by way of Dēvagiri without meeting serious opposition on the way; defeated the Kākatīya forces, laid siege to and captured the outside mud fort, and invested the inner stone fort. Pratāparudra sued for peace. Malik Nā'ib Kāfūr agreed to accede to his request on condition that he surrendered all his wealth, together with his elephants and horses, jewels and valuables and promised to send every year a certain amount of treasure and a certain number of elephants by way of tribute to Delhi. Pratāparudra who had no alternative accepted the conditions and Malik Nā'ib Kāfūr raised the siege, and marched away to Delhi laden with booty.³

Of the next invasion, which was sent from Dēvagiri in 1318 A. D. by Sultān Quṭb-ud-dīn Mubārak Shāh, two conflicting accounts have come down to us. The cause of the expedition was the failure of Pratāparudra to pay the annual tribute for some years. To collect the arrears of this tribute, the Sultān sent Khusru Khān at the head of an army to Tiling. According to Amīr Khusru, Pratāparudra offered resistance, but was defeated and had to purchase peace at a very heavy price. Amīr Khusru's account of Khusru Khān's expedition to Tiling reads like another version of Nalik Nā'ib Kāfūr's invasion in 1310 A. D. The encounter with Pratāparudra's forces, their defeat, the investment and capture of the mud fort, the attack on the stone fort, and Pratāparudra's surrender of all his wealth besides elephants and horses, follow the same pattern.⁴ 'Iṣāmy, who also describes Khusru Khān's expedition to Tiling, narrates the events differently; he does not refer to hostilities. Pratāparudra, on the contrary, is said to have received Khusru Khān with respect, paid the tribute due to the Sultān readily and sent him back to Dēvagiri well satisfied.⁵ Which of these two accounts is true is not easy to decide.

¹ Elliot, *History of India*, Vol. III, p. 179.

² Ibid., p. 189, Nizām-ud-dīn Ahmad makes a casual reference to this expedition. 'The flower of the Sultān's army had, however, marched to the extreme south of the Dakin, to conquer Arangal' (*Tabaqat-i-Akbarī*, Eng. trans., Vol. I, p. 173). Ferishta also states that owing to the absence of his army, which went on an expedition to Waranagal, 'Alā-ud-dīn was in no condition to face the Mughal invader Targhī on equal terms (Briggs, *Ferishta*, Vol. I., p. 354).

³ Ibid., p. 202-03.

⁴ A few variations, no doubt, occur. Pratāparudra is said to have ceded five districts of his kingdom to the Sultān; these were, however, given back excepting the fort of Badrkot (Elliot, *History of India*, Vol. III, pp 558-61).

⁵ *Futūḥ-us-Salātīn* (Madras edn.), pp. 361-63.

Two more expeditions came during the time of the Tughluqs, who succeeded the Khaljis on the throne of Delhi. Both were despatched by Sultān Ghiyāṣ-ud-dīn Tughluq Shāh (1320-25 A. D.), under the command of his son Ulugh Khān (the later Muḥammad bin Tughluq) in 1323 A. D. The first of these ended in disaster. Ulugh Khān suffered defeat, partly due to dissensions in his camp and the treachery of his officers, under the walls of Warangal, and was compelled to retreat at first to Dēvagiri and thence to Delhi. He returned, however, within four months at the head of a fresh and powerful army, and succeeded after a siege of six or seven months in capturing not only Warangal but also Pratāparudra, whom he sent to Delhi as a prisoner of war.

The Muslim historians thus enumerate five expeditions between 1303 and 1323 against Tiling, of which three were successful and the rest abortive. The Hindu records on the other hand refer to several Muslim expeditions—eight according to the present grant—of which all, excepting the very last, ended in the defeat of the Muslim armies and their expulsion from Tiling. Although these are said to have taken place in the reign of Pratāparudra, the exact time of their arrival and the circumstances in which they suffered defeat are not known. There is reason to believe that the Kākatīyas came into conflict with the Mussalmans long before 'Alā-ud-Dīn Khaljī's attack on Dēvagiri in 1296 A. D. An epigraph in the temple of Chhāyā-Sōmanātha at Pānugallu in the Nalgonda District of Andhra Pradesh dated 1267 A. D. describes the victories of Prince Śārngapāṇidēva, the son of the Sēuṇa king Singhaṇa and a subordinate of *Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara* Manuma-Rudradēva-mahārāja, i. e. the Kākatīya queen Rudrāmbā or Rudramadēvī. Among his exploits enumerated in the inscription, his victory over the Mussalmans deserves particular mention. Śārngapāṇidēva is spoken of in this record as the Primeval Boar who rescued the earth from the Turushka calamity.¹

The Mussalmans also seem to have descended upon the Deccan a little later from another quarter. In an epigraph at the Kallēśvaradēva temple at Haḷuvāgilu in the Bellary District dated Ś. 1204, Chitrabhānu (1282 A. D.), the Yādava king Rāmachandra, that is, Rāmadēva, the adversary of 'Alā-ud-dīn Khaljī, is described as a rescuer of earth from the depredation of Turushkas.²

The circumstances in which these Turushka invasions took place are not on record. Some of the expeditions sent by Balban against the Central Indian Hindu kingdoms probably penetrated into the Deccan, but being worsted in the fight by the Kākatīyas and the Yādavas they were compelled to retreat homewards.

The Muslim invasions of Tiling began in right earnest after Pratāparudra's accession in 1296 A.D. According to the present grant, which was issued within a decade of the Muslim conquest, the Muslims attacked Tiling no less than eight times. Pratāparudra is said to have defeated the Sultān of Delhi seven times, but was vanquished, owing to the misfortune of the earth, on the last occasion by that Turushka sovereign, and while being carried away as a prisoner to Delhi, died by the decree of Providence on the bank of the Sōmōdbhavā (Narmadā) river. This is not the only record that refers to the defeat of the Muhammadans. An inscription, noticed by the Mackenzie Surveyors in the fort of Warangal, refers to a victory of Manaraṅgodarirāju and Layiṅgayadēva over the Turakas in Samvat 1362 (1304-05 A.D.).³ The proximity of the

¹ *Corp. Inscr. Tel. Dist.*, p. 98. No. 34. As most of the chiefs mentioned in this inscription figure in Singhaṇa's inscriptions as the foes conquered by him (*Bomb. Gaz.*, Vol. I, ii. pp. 239-43), Śārngapāṇidēva seems to have participated in his father's wars and took credit for his victories before he accepted service under the Kākatīyas. Although the Turushkas, among the peoples of many other countries, are said, in very general terms, to have obeyed his commands, the Turushka invasion is not mentioned in any of his inscriptions. It is not therefore unlikely that the invasion took place after Śārngapāṇidēva had entered the service of the Kākatīyas.

² *A. R. Ep.*, No. 224 of 1918; *SII*, Vol. IX, Part I, No. 380.

³ *Mack. Mss.*, 15-3-20, p. 101.

date of this inscription to that of the first recorded Khaljī expedition seems to indicate that Manaraṅgodarirāju and Layiṅgayadēva opposed the Turakas successfully on this occasion and forced them to return to their country. A damaged epigraph at Śrīśailam in the Kurnool District states that the Kākatīya general, *Mahārāyasthāpanāchārya* Kāchaya-reḍḍi, son of Mailaya-reḍḍi, who placed the Kākita throne on a firm footing, vanquished the Turaka king, who invaded the Teluṅga country after subjugating Gauḷa, Gūrjara, Mālava, Mahārāshṭra and other countries.¹ The Turaka king vanquished by Kāchaya-reḍḍi was in all probability 'Alā-ud-dīn Khaljī; for though he is not known to have conquered Gauḷa (Lakhnāutī), the other countries mentioned in the record were subjugated between 1296 and 1310 A.D. either by 'Alā-ud-dīn himself or one of his generals. The occasion when Kāchaya-reḍḍi defeated the Turakas cannot, however, be ascertained definitely; for, in the first place, the Śrīśailam epigraph which registers his victory bears no date. Secondly, it cannot be referred to either of the two expeditions which 'Alā-ud-dīn is known to have sent against Tiling. The first of these which was despatched in 1303 A.D. no doubt ended, as pointed out already, in disaster; but the conquest of Mālava and Gūrjara referred to in the Śrīśailam record was not effected, by that time. 'Alā-ud-dīn was still engaged in Rajputana. Mālava was conquered in 1305 A.D. and Gūrjara (Gujarat) in 1309 A.D. The Śrīśailam epigraph must be assigned therefore to a date subsequent to the conquest of these countries. The second invasion according to the unanimous testimony of all the Muslim historians was a great triumph of the Sultān's armies; and it is highly improbable that Kāchaya-reḍḍi effected the destruction of Turaka forces on this occasion. Therefore Kāchaya-reḍḍi's victory must have taken place in the course of another expedition, which is not recorded for some reason by the court historians of Delhi.

Telugu literary tradition handed down from the beginning of the fifteenth century A.D. preserves also the memory of several victories of Pratāparudra and his generals over the Eussal-mans. The poet Śrīnātha, who flourished at the courts of the Reḍḍi kings of Koṇḍaviḍu and Rajahmūndry in the first half of the fifteenth century refers, in the introduction to his *Bhīmēśvara Purāṇamu*, to Prōlaya Anna, one of Pratāparudra's ministers as the "fire of destruction to the *Yavanas*".² The *Śivayōgasāram* speaks of *Mahāpradhāni* Gannaya Pregarā, another minister of Pratāparudra, as the vanquisher of the Turakas and the protector of the fort of Warangal.³ The *Velugōṭivāri Vamśāvali*, a chronicle of the Rēcherla chiefs of the Velugōḍu family alludes to the battle of Kolachelamapura, in which Rēcherla Yācha, son of Prasāditya, put to flight the Turakas and having captured their horses took them to the court.⁴ The *birudāvali* of some of the Nāyaka families that were in the service of the Kākatīya monarchs alludes also to the Hindu

¹ *A. R. Ep.*, No. 54 of 1942-43.

² *Bhīmēśvara Purāṇamu*, 1. 48.

Yavana-samhāra-vilaya-kālāgni-yanaga

vinutik=ekken=atula-bala-sīri

Prōlaya-Anna-sauri

³ The concerned passage reads :

ōpi Turukala gelchi Pratāparudra-manuja-nāyaku kōṭan=emaraka kāche.

ā [Sultān=Ōrugall-ena] chuṭṭu-muṭṭan=ekkuva-līla=dāne [kal-kō]ṭa gāche.

Kākit=ēsuḍu mechcha galu-kōṭa vesa gāchi.

Published in the *Kākatīya Samchika* and the Telugu journal *Subhāshi*.

⁴ *Velugōṭivāri Vamśāvali*, p. 14, verse 48.

Turakalan=dōli tal-sainya-rāji
ghōr-āji-dhāfi chellan Golachalam-purin ghōṭikā-kōṭi=dechchen.

victories over Muslim armies of Delhi.¹ The *Pratāpacharitra*, a late quasi-historical prose work, states, like the present record under consideration, that there were no less than eight Muslim invasions against Warangal, and that though Pratāparudra vanquished and put them to flight on the first seven occasions, he suffered defeat during the last expedition. Warangal fell into the hands of the Turakas, and he himself was carried away as a prisoner to Delhi.²

Though the Muslim and the Hindu sources are in perfect agreement regarding the final conquest of the Kākatīya kingdom and the captivity of Pratāparudra, they are at variance about the number of Muslim expeditions and the events that happened in them. Whereas contemporary epigraphic evidence fixes their number at eight, Muslim historians mention only five. The difference is perhaps due to the omission, by the latter, of abortive attempts of conquest, which they considered unworthy of notice. While the Hindu sources claim victory uniformly over the Mussalmans in all expeditions excepting the last, the Muslim historians admit defeat only twice which they attribute to unforeseen circumstances. There is reason to believe that the Kākatīyas were not so uniformly successful against the Mussalmans as the Hindu records would have us believe. *Chātu* verses addressed to Pōtugaṅṭi Maili, one of the *Nāyakas* in the service of Kākatīya Pratāparudra, describe an event which happened in the court of 'Alā-ud-dīn *Khalji* at Delhi. For some reason unknown at present Maili is said to have vanquished the Telugu-Chōḍa chief Bijjana at *Dakhōḷ* in Delhi in the presence of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn, Malik Nēmār (Malik Nā'ib Kāfūr?), the unrivalled hero, and the seventy-seven *Nāyakas* (of Pratāparudra's court).³ The presence of so many Kākatīya nobles at Delhi, and the duel between Maili and Bijjana at *Dākhōḷ* before 'Alā-ud-dīn and Malik Nēmār seem to indicate the existence of intimate political relations between Delhi and Warangal. The Muslim historians refer, as a matter of fact, to the arrival of Kākatīya officials to the court of the Sultān to pay the annual tribute into the imperial treasury.⁴ Maili and Bijjana probably escorted the tribute to Delhi on one of the occasions, when during their stay in the capital, the duel described in the *Chātu* verses was fought.

¹ The chiefs of the Gōsagi family, for instance, claim to have wrested from Ulugh *Khān*, the seven constituents of his royalty : *Ulughu-Khāna-saptāṅga-harāna* (*Mack. Mss.*, 15-5-32).

² *J. Tel. Ac.*, Vol. VII, pp. 304-5.

³ See *Chāṭupadyamaṇimānjari*, ii, p. 63 :

Dhillilō Surathānuḍ=Allāvādīn-dhar-ādhyakshuṇḍu pratyaksha-sākshi-gāga,
mahāniya-jayaśāli Maliki Nēmāruṇḍu jagad-ēka-sūruṇḍu sākshi-gāga
jagatipai ḍebbad=ēḍuguru nāyamkulun=akshīṇa-bala-yutul sākshi-gāga
sahaja-sāhasa-yuddha-sannaddha-vara-bhaṭ-āśrayam=aina Dākōlu sākshi-gāga
Sūrya-vamśōdaya-khyātuḍ=ārya Telugu-
Bijjala-nripālu gelche dad-bhīma-balūḍu
vairi-gaja-bhīmuḍ=amita-satya-priyumuḍu
ghana-bhujāśāliy=agu Pōtugaṅṭi Maili.

⁴ Elliot, *History of India*, Vol. III, p. 204 : 'At the end of the same year (H. 711) twenty elephants arrived in Delhi from Laddar Deo, Rāi of Tilāṅg, with a letter stating that he was ready to pay at Dēvgīr, to any one whom the Sultān would commission to receive it, the treasure which had been engaged to pay, thus fulfilling the terms of the treaty with Malik Kāfūr.' On another occasion, some of the Kākatīya officials who were on their way to Delhi are said to have paid tribute to the Malik Nā'ib Kāfūr whom they met in his camp on the banks of the Narmadā. See *Khusrū, Khazain Khaz-ul-Futūh*, p. 83 :

'After the rivers, mountains and valleys had been crossed, a present of twenty-three elephants, huge as Elburz, arrived from the Rāi of Tiling.'

Iḡāmy also alludes to Pratāparudra's practice of payment of tribute to Delhi.—

'I am a slave of the king', said Rudradēv, and "I shall go to the *Khān*, the commander of his forces. It was in my mind to send the tribute to the king in the capital; but as the roads are infested with malefactors I hesitated to send it to the court." See *Futūh-us-Salātīn* (Madras edn.), p. 362.

The association of the Kākatīya and the Muslim forces in the war against the Pāṇḍya kingdom to restore Sundara-pāṇḍya to his ancestral throne points also in the same direction. Wassāf, it may be remembered, refers to the flight of Sundara-pāṇḍya to Delhi. 'Sundara Pandi, trembling and alarmed', says he, 'fled from his native country and took refuge under the protection of 'Alā-ud-dīn of Delhi.'¹ Although no information is available from Muslim sources as to what happened afterwards, one of the inscriptions at Tirukkalar in the Mannargudi Taluk of the Tanjore District, dated in the 25th regnal year of Jaṭāvarman Śrīvallabha (1316 A.D.), alludes to the arrival of the Muhammadan forces in support of Sundara-pāṇḍya. It is stated that sometime before the date of the inscription, Rājarāja Sundara-pāṇḍya came with the Tulukkar, when a certain chief called Okkūruḍaiyan died together with his brothers and followers obviously in a fight against them.² The Tulukkar were not the only supporters of Sundara-pāṇḍya. A large Kākatīya force under Pratāparudra's famous general Muppiḍi-nāyaka was at the same time operating on his behalf in the Tamil country. An inscription at Vṛiddhāchalam in the South Arcot District dated in 13+1st year of Tribhuvanachakravartin Kōnēriṇmaikoṇḍāṇ Sundara-pāṇḍyadēva (1315 A.D.) registers the assignment of income from lands in some villages for conducting a service named after Muppiḍi-nāyaka, the ruler of Vikramasimhapattana (Nellore) and one of the ministers of Kākatīya Pratāparudradēva, in the temple of the god Vṛiddhagiriśvara.³ From this it is evident that Muppiḍi-nāyaka, the minister of Kākatīya Pratāparudradēva, was an ally of Sundara-pāṇḍya who caused the service to be instituted in the temple to honour him. Though the cause of Muppiḍi's presence in the Pāṇḍyan territory is not disclosed in the record, the Śrīraṅgam epigraph of Dēvari-nāyaḍu, dated 1317 A.D. leaves no room for doubt that the Kākatīya armies came there to restore Sundara-pāṇḍya to his ancestral throne.⁴ If Rājarāja Sundara-pāṇḍya of the Tirukkalar record is the same as Sundara-pāṇḍya of the inscription from Vṛiddhāchalam cited above, it may be surmised that the Muhammadan and Kākatīya forces were both fighting in the Pāṇḍyan kingdom in and around 1315 A.D., and that they were both allies of Sundara-pāṇḍya. It is not unreasonable to believe that the Kākatīya monarch sent his armies to the south at the instance of Sultān 'Alā-ud-dīn Khaljī to support the contingent of Muhammadan forces sent thither by the latter to restore Sundara-pāṇḍya to his kingdom. Therefore, it is not possible to accept without reserve the statement in the Vilasa grant and some other later records that Pratāparudra was invariably victorious over the Muslim armies on all occasions excepting the last.

Next, the present inscription throws some new light on the circumstances in which Pratāparudra met with his death. According to Shams-i-Shirāj Afif, the Rāi of Tiling, whom Sultān Muhammad sent to Delhi, died upon the road.⁵ The correctness of the statement has, however, been questioned. On the authority of inscriptions, it has been said that Pratāparudra did not die on his way to Delhi; he was not only rescued and freed by some Nāyakas from captivity, but continued to rule his kingdom for some years after that. An inscription at Santamāgalūru in the Narasaraopet Taluk of the Guntur District dated 1326 A.D. mentions Pratāparudra as the ruler of the kingdom, and registers a gift for his merit by Kolani Rudradēva, one of his mahāpradhānis. This furnishes, as pointed out by H. Krishna Sastri, a date 'four years later than the latest date given for Pratāparudra.'⁶ Coupled with the evidence of this record,

¹ Elliot, *History of India*, Vol. III, p. 54.

² *A.R.Ep.*, No. 642 of 1902; *SII*, Vol. VIII, No. 247.

³ *Ibid.*, 72 of 1918.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 79 of 1938-39

⁵ *History of India*, op. cit. Vol. III, p. 367.

⁶ *A.R.Ep.*, No. 308 of 1915; *ibid.*, 1916, Part II, para. 53.

the title *Rāya-bandī-vimōchaka*, said to have been borne by Rēcherla Siṅgama I, one of the *Nāyakas* in the service of Pratāparudra, has given rise to the belief that he rescued the king from captivity and that the latter continued to rule his kingdom even after the fall of Warangal in 1323 A.D.¹ Now, the Santamāgalūru inscription is a solitary record unsupported by other evidence; and no trace of Pratāparudra's rule is found anywhere subsequent to his capture by Ulugh Khān. Moreover, the Muslim forces were still busy with the subjugation of the country and they would not have tolerated Pratāparudra's rule in any part of it. The setting up of an inscription at Santamāgalūru by Kolani Rudradēva in 1326 A.D. must be attributed to the feelings of loyalty to his old master and his irreconcilable hostility to the Mussalmans who had overthrown his authority. The title *Rāya-bandī-vimōchaka* is of uncertain origin. There is no evidence to show that it was ever borne by Siṅgama I. None of his records has come down to us; and the *Velugōtivāri Vamśāvali* does not associate the title with his name. It occurs for the first time in an inscription of his son Anavōta I, dated 1369 A.D., at Ayyanavōlu in the Warangal District.² Anavōta I was not a contemporary of Pratāparudra, and he could not have participated in that monarch's wars with the Muhammadans. Therefore, the origin of his title *Rāya-bandī-vimōchaka* must be traced to some event which must have taken place in his (Anavōta's) own time.

The present inscription, which must have been issued within about a decade or so of the Muslim conquest of Tiling, not only confirms the evidence of Shams-i-Shirāj ' Afīf that Pratāparudra died on his way to Delhi but also specifies the locality where his death had taken place as the bank of the river Sōmōdbhavā (verse 20). There is reason to believe that he did not suffer natural death, but put an end, unable to bear perhaps captivity, to his own existence. In the Kaluvachēru grant of the Redḍi queen Anitalli dated 1423 A.D., exactly a century after the fall of Warangal, it is stated that Pratāparudra departed to the world of the gods by his own desire.³ This seems to suggest that he either committed suicide or was slain at his own instance by one of his own followers.

The statement that, on the death of Pratāparudra, the entire Āndhra country passed into the hands of the Muhammadans is corroborated by the evidence of other contemporary and nearly contemporary records. The Rajahmundry mosque inscription of Sālār ' Ulwī bears testimony to the subjugation of the Gōdāvari delta.⁴ The *Futūḥ-us-Salāṭīn* refers to the conquest of Kalinga and the capture of the forts of Gooty (Anantapur District) and Kanti (Gandikōṭa in the Cuddapah District).⁵ A *chāṭu* verse in Telugu addressed to Saṅgama II (1356 A.D.), nephew of Harihara I and Bukka I of Vijayanagara, alludes to Muslim occupation of the Nellore District immediately after the rule of Muppidi-nāyaka (1323 A.D.).⁶ Although the Āndhra country was thus rapidly subjugated, it did not long remain under Muslim rule. This was mainly due to the oppressive character of their government which is vividly portrayed in the present inscription (vv. 22-27). Unlike other conquerors of India, the Mussalmans were not satisfied with the acquisition of mere political power. They descended on the Deccan not as mere conquerors in search of new countries but as crusading warriors to spread the true faith in the land of the infidels. To stamp out heathenism, and gather all the people within the fold of Islam, they prohibited, as

¹ M. Rama Rao, *Kākatīyas of Warangal*, pp. 97-98.

² *Velugōtivāri Vamśācharitra*, Appendix No. 4.

³ *J.Tel.Ac.*, Vol. II, p. 106.

*Tasmin Pratāparudrē eva-sthānam sv-ēchchhay=aiya yātavati
atha sā bhūr=Yavanamayī jāt=aiṣ=āhō mahāmahō mahimā.*

⁴ *A.R.Ep.*, No. 426 of 1926.

⁵ *Futūḥ-us-Salāṭīn* (Madras edn.), pp. 402-03; also p. 31.

⁶ *Chāṭupadyamaṣimānjari* :—*Muppidi taṅaṅ=ēle mudamutō Turak=ēle.*

stated in the inscription, the public exercise of Hindu religion, and subjected its followers to inhuman tyranny. The Hindus could not dress well, live well, and appear to be prosperous. Vexatious taxes were imposed on them; their seats of learning were destroyed; their temples were plundered and demolished; and the images of their gods were defaced and broken and used as building material for erecting prayer houses for the faithful. That this is not an exaggeration but genuine truth is proved by independent accounts of the condition of the Hindus in other parts of South India subjugated by the Mussalmans. Gaṅgādēvī, the queen of Kumāra Kampana (1340-74 A.D.), presents in her *Madhurāvijayam*, a harrowing picture of devastation caused by the Muhammadans in the Tamil country. 'The temples in the land', says she 'have fallen into neglect as worship in them has been stopped. Within their walls the frightful howls of jackals have taken the place of the sweet reverberations of the *mṛidaṅga*. Like the Turushkas who know no limits, the Kāvērī has forgotten her ancient boundaries and brings frequent destruction with her floods. The sweet odour of the sacrificial smoke and the chant of the Vēdas have deserted the villages (*agrahāras*), which are now filled with the foul smell of the roasted flesh and the fierce noises of the ruffianly Turushkas. The suburban gardens of Madura present a most painful sight; many of their beautiful cocoanut palms have been cut down; and on every side are seen rows of stakes from which swing strings of human skulls strung together. The Tāmraparṇī is flowing red with the blood of the slaughtered cows. The *Vēda* is forgotten and justice has gone into hiding; there is not left any trace of virtue or nobility in the land, and despair is writ large on the faces of the unfortunate Drāviḍas.'¹

Unable to bear the grinding tyranny of the Musalmans, which was set on foot to wipe out their race, religion and culture, the Āndhras as a people joined together and rose up in revolt. Nobles and common folk, if we can trust the evidence of the inscription under consideration, voluntarily flocked to the standard of Prōlaya-nāyaka to rid the country of the barbarous hordes of Islām, which by the decree of an evil fate descended on their native land. The Brāhmaṇas and the farmers of the soil paid, of their own free will, taxes to enable the leaders to carry on the struggle for freedom successfully. It was the first national movement in Indian history; and the Āndhras showed to the rest of India how a people could, by their united effort, expel the enemy and regain their lost freedom.

This was no easy task. Muḥammad bin Tughluq was a powerful monarch, who was cruel and merciless in crushing his enemies. No Hindu ruler of the South, however strong and warlike, was able to resist the irresistible advance of his armies. It is noteworthy that in that deplorable state of utter helplessness, the Āndhras were able to organise themselves into a confederacy, strike a blow to gain independence, and successfully accomplish their purpose.

The information furnished by the grant under review about the Musunūri family is very meagre. It simply states that king Prōla of the Musunūri family was born in the fourth caste; he headed the movement to free the country from the Muslim yoke, and having successfully driven them out, he made Rēkapalli on the Gōdāvarī at the foot of the Mālyavanta mountain his capital and entrusted the administration of the country to his younger brothers, such as Kāpaya-nāyaka, devoting himself entirely to the performance of charitable and meritorious deeds. Nothing is known from this grant about Prōlaya-nāyaka's history and career, except that he had many younger brothers, of whom Kāpaya-nāyaka was one. This dearth of information about his family is made up by the Prōlavaram grant of Kāpaya-nāyaka,² dated in the Śaka year 1267, expressed by the chronogram *giri-tarka-bhānu*, in the cyclic year Pārthiva. As he is also stated in the grant to have belonged to the Musunūri family and as the date of the grant is very near to

¹ K.A.N Sastri, *The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom*, pp. 242-43.

² *A. R. Ep.*, 1934-35, C. P. No. 3. Cf. *JBORS*, Vol. XX, pp. 260 ff.

the date of the fall of Warangal, there need be no doubt that he is identical with Kāpaya-nāyaka, Prōla's brother mentioned in the grant under review. Fortunately for us, the Prōlavaram grant furnishes a short pedigree of three generations of the Musunūri chiefs born in the fourth caste. Pōta, the earliest known member of the family, had four sons, namely, Pōcha, Dēva, Kāma and Rāja. The first three brothers had two sons each, namely, Prōla and Eṛapōta, Kāpa and Mummaḍīsa, and Immaḍīsa and Dēva respectively; and Rāja, the last son of Pōta, had only one son by name Anavōta, otherwise known as Toyyēṭi Anavōta, or Anavōta of Toyyēṛu. From this it becomes clear that Prōla and Eṛapōta were the only sons of Pōcha, and that Kāpa and others were, strictly speaking, Prōlaya-nāyaka's cousins (that is, his paternal uncles' sons and not his own brothers). Even the Prōlavaram grant does not furnish any information about Kāpaya-nāyaka's grandfather Pōta and his father and uncles, except giving the pedigree. Probably these members of the Musunūri family were ordinary *Nāyakas* of no great importance and played no part in the momentous history of the period during and after the reign of the last Kākatīya emperor, Pratāparudra. Prōla and his brothers, especially Kāpaya-nāyaka, seem to have been the only members of the family that came to limelight during the period of the Muslim occupation of the Āndhra country immediately after the fall of Warangal by their deeds of valour, and untiring efforts to unite and inspire the people of the country and liberate it from the Muslim yoke. Except Kāpaya-nāyaka none of the other cousins of Prōlaya finds mention either in the grant under review or in the Prōlavaram grant of Kāpaya-nāyaka. Probably they were young and achieved nothing worthy of note during that troublous period, or it may be that some of them lost their lives during those days of anarchy, and the oppressive and autocratic rule of the Mussalmans. It is, however, certain that Kāpaya-nāyaka was the right hand man of Prōlaya-nāyaka, whom he actively supported and co-operated with in every way in waging war on the Mussalmans and expelling them from the Āndhra country.

There is another record, the Kaluvachēṛu grant of Anitalli,¹ dated in Śaka 1345, (1423 A.D.), that should be taken into account here for a better understanding of the political conditions of the country immediately after the fall of Warangal, even though it is separated in time by nearly a century from the grant under review. It is stated in the introductory portion of the Kaluvachēṛu grant that after Pratāparudra of the Kākatīya dynasty, the lord of Triliṅga (Telugu country), had gone to heaven by his own will, the whole land was occupied by the Muslims (*Yavanamayī jātā*); Prōlaya-nāyaka then raised the country that was enveloped in the womb of the Yavanas (*Yavan-ōḍara-stha*) just like Varāha, the boar incarnation of Viṣṇu, who raised the land submerged under water. After Prōlaya-nāyaka went as a guest to heaven at the command of Viśvēśvara, the same grant further says, Kāpaya-nāyaka who was equal in splendour to the sun, ruled his kingdom, and that he whose feet were served by the seventyfive *Nāyakas*, protected the earth by the grace of Viśvēśvara. King Kāpa is said to have regranted to Brāhmaṇas, the *agrahāras* taken over by the Turushkas, besides granting them some afresh. After the death of Kāpa, all the *Nāyakas* subordinate to him are said to have gone to their towns and protected their respective countries.

Prōlaya-nāyaka and Kāpaya mentioned thus in the introductory portion of the Kaluvachēṛu grant are, no doubt, respectively identical with the donors of the grant under review and the Prōlavaram grant, although their family name Musunūri does not find mention in the latter. The Kaluvachēṛu grant further makes it clear that after rescuing the Āndhra country from the Muslim yoke, Prōla and after him Kāpa ruled it one after the other and that the seventy-five *Nāyakas*,

¹ *J. Tel. Ac.*, Vol. II, pp. 93-112; *Bhārati*, Vol. XXI, Part I, pp. 553-57, Part II, pp. 61-72.

the survivors as well as the sons of those that perished in the struggle, acknowledged their supremacy and leadership and served them faithfully.

Let us see if we can spot out any of the *Nāyakas* that served Prōla and Kāpa and co-operated with them in liberating the country. With the fall of Warangal, the leadership of the coastal region passed from the hands of the kings of the Lunar and Solar dynasties into those of the *Nāyakas* of the Musunūri family of the fourth caste. Of the other *Nāyakas* of this period, we already know that Vēma was one. Most of the chiefs, ministers and commanders of the Kākatiya emperor, Pratāparudra, lost their lives in the last fatal siege of Warangal. A few, who had survived the disaster, are known to us from both inscriptions and literature. One of them was Kolani Rudradēva *alias* Pratāparudra, the *mahāpradhāni* of Kākati Pratāparudra and son of Gannaya-mantri. He was a contemporary of Anna-mantri and a great Sanskrit scholar and the author of *Rājarudrīyam*, a work on grammar.¹ He was the grandson of Kolani Sōma-mantri, the minister of Kākati Gaṇapatidēva and the subjugator of the *māṇḍalikas* of Kolanuvidū or Sarasīpurī. It is known from the *Śivayōgasāraṁ*, a Telugu work on Śaiva theology, written by Gaṇapatidēva of the Kolani family, that Kolani Rudradēva had taken part in the expedition to Kāñchīpura (1315 A.D.) during the reign of Pratāparudra and defeated the five Pāṇḍya chiefs. The statement in the same work that he protected the stone fort of Warangal so as to win the commendation of Kākatēsa (i.e. Pratāparudra) and that he slew some Yavana chiefs, makes it clear that he had taken an active part in the wars with the Mussalmans. Yet it appears strange that none of his records prior to 1323 A.D. has come to light. An epigraph at Santamāgalūru² in the Guntur District dated in the cyclic year *Kshaya*, corresponding to Śaka 1248 (1326 A.D.) in the reign of Kākati Pratāparudra, registers a gift of land to the temple of Gōpīnātha of that village by Kolani Rudradēva for the merit of that king on the occasion of a solar eclipse. Pratāparudra, as we know, was already dead by the date of this record. It has therefore to be presumed that Rudradēva, the donor of the record, shook off by that time the Muslim yoke and was free to make at his will a grant of land for the merit of his late master out of respect and devotion.

Another survivor was Anna-mantri of the Beṇḍapūḍi family, the *Gajasāhīni* of Kākati Pratāparudra, who is described in the *Bhīmēśvara Purāṇam* of Śrīnātha as the veritable fire in annihilating the *Yavanas* and the establisher of the throne of the *adhyaksha* of the Āndhra country.³ The term *adhyaksha*, which means supervisor or president (and not king), no doubt refers to Prōlaya-nāyaka, and probably to Kāpaya-nāyaka also after him. This title suggests that it was through the successful efforts of Anna-mantri that the selection of the supervisor or the president of the confederacy of nobles of the Āndhra country was made possible and that the president so elected was made acceptable to all the chiefs, who combined together to liberate the country. The title is meaningless, if this is not its import. Thus, the title indicates, in unmistakable terms, the successful and prominent part played by Anna-mantri of the Beṇḍapūḍi family. The same work, *Bhīmēśvara Purāṇam*, referred to above, informs us that Anna-mantri received the village of Ārēḍu, which was full of many crops grown by the supply of canal waters, as an *agrahāra* on the occasion of a solar eclipse. There must have been some significance for the special mention of Rudradēva's gift of this village to Anna-mantri. If this solar eclipse, on which the village was granted, was the same as that mentioned in Rudradēva's Santamāgalūru record, cited above, this grant must have been made to Anna-mantri soon after the successful culmination of the war of independence and the liberation of the coastal region, probably in appreciation of his services to

¹ *Rājarudrīyam* : *Ādirāja-Kākatiya-Pratāparudra-pradhāna-varyasya Mudrāka-Gannaya-sūnu-rachitam Vārttikavyākhyānam*.

² *A. R. Ep.*, No. 308 of 1915.

³ *Bhīmēśvara Purāṇam*, I. 48: *Āndhra-bhūmamḍal-ādhyaksha-simhāsana-sampratishṭhāpan-āchārya*.

the cause of freedom. It is certain that it could not have been possible for Rudradēva to make this grant of a village as an *agrahāra* while the coastal country was under the iron grip of the Musalmans. These two facts mentioned above, namely, the title borne by Anna-mantri and the grant of an *agrahāra* to him by Kolani Rudradēva, clearly suggest the important role played by these two aged Āndhra statesmen in the national movement started for the liberation of the Āndhra country.

Siṅgaya-nāyaka, son of Eṛa Dāchā-nāyaka of the Rēcherla family, was another survivor of the disaster. His father Eṛa Dācha accompanied Muppiḍi-nāyaka in his expedition against the Pāṇdyas to Kāñchīpura in 1315 A.D. He is said to have "constructed a *maṇḍala* with arrows and on the dias of the elephants made an offering of the pride of the Pāṇḍya king in the *hōma* fire of his valour and accepted the hand of the bride of victory."¹ His son Siṅgaya also must have followed his father and taken part in the battle of Kāñchī. All his activities described in the Telugu work *Velugōṭivāri Vamśāvali* refer to the early post-Kākatiya period.²

Kūnaya-nāyaka, the son of Gaṇapati-nāyaka and the grandson of Kēsami-nāyaka was another contemporary of Prōlaya-nāyaka and Kāpaya-nāyaka. Kēsami-nāyaka who is said to have won a victory against the Pāṇdyas according to the Kōrukōṇḍa inscription of Mummaḍi-nāyaka,³ must have served Pratāparudra and taken part in the expedition against Kāñchī.

The *Vīrasāmanta* chiefs, Kāpaya-nāyaka and Prōlaya-nāyaka, also must have been the contemporaries of the Musunūri chiefs since the date of the Dōnepūḍi record of Nāmaya-nāyaka, grandson of Kāpa and son of Prōla, is dated in Śaka 1259.⁴

Similarly the Uṇḍirājas of the Solar race, Veṅga-bhūpati, king of Vēṅgī, and his relations, the Telugu Chōḍa chiefs of Ēruva, Gaṅgādhara and his son Chōḍa Bhaktirāja, especially the latter, co-operated with the Musunūri chiefs in the war of independence.⁵

All the *Nāyakas* and chiefs mentioned above, besides many others whose names are not known to us, must have formed into a confederacy, acknowledged the leadership of Prōlaya-nāyaka and gathered under his banner to free the country from the foreign yoke. These confederates must have made the mountainous regions and forest areas on the banks of the Gōḍāvarī and the Kṛishṇā their rendezvous to put into action their plans to free the country, first the coastal plain below the Ghats and then the upland country of Tēlaṅgāna above the Ghats.

The various measures concerted by Prōlaya-nāyaka and his associates to liberate the country from the Muslim yoke and how they accomplished their object are totally unknown to us. We know, however, for certain that Madhya-Āndhradēśa, as the coastal Āndhra country was then called, very soon had regained its independence, almost within two or three years after its subjugation by the Muslims. Warangal fell in 1323 A.D.; but the whole of Tēlaṅgāna and Madhya-Āndhradēśa did not immediately come under the sway of the Muslims. There was strong opposition to the Muslim army. However, the coastal plain submitted to the arms of the conquering hordes within a year, that is, by the 10th September, 1324 A.D., the date of the construction

¹ A. R., Arch. Dept., Hyderabad, 1933-34, p. 29, App. C.

² *Velugōṭivāri Vamśāvali*, pp. 16-17.

³ A. R. Ep., No. 44 of 1912.

⁴ Ibid., 1906, App. A. No. 21; above, Vol. XIV, p. 83.

⁵ Ibid., 1946-47, App. A. No. 3.

of the big mosque at Rajahmundry by Sālār 'Ulwī, a servant of Ulugh Khān'.¹ By this date the conquest of the whole of the coastal region of the Āndhra country was complete. Ghiyās-ud-dīn Tughluq's coins discovered in this part of the country, ranging in dates from A.H. 722 to 726² (i.e. from 1322 to 1326 A.D.) were current in that region. However, the year 1325 A.D., the date of the Mallavaram stone record of Vēmā Redḍi,³ marks the turning of the tide, and indicates the beginning, and 1326 A.D., the date of the Santamāgalūru record⁴ of Kolani Rudradēva, the completion of the re-conquest and the final liberation of the coastal region of the Āndhra country. A few inscriptions of the early post-Kākatīya period, of the Telugu-Chōḍas and the Redḍis, however, contain references to their victories over the Muslims in general, and of the particular Muslim chiefs and commanders, in the course of the war. The Peṅṭapāḍu grant of Chōḍa Bhaktirāja⁵ is a very interesting record in this respect, as it furnishes some valuable information about Prōlaya-nāyaka and a certain Vēṅga-bhūpati. From this we learn that subsequent to the death of the father of Chōḍa Bhaktirāja, who was then a boy, the Āndhra country (*avanī-chakram=Āndhrām*) was conquered (*hṛitam*) by the Yavanas (Mussalmans), when the valourous and righteous Prōlaya-nāyaka, son of the heroic Pōchaya-nāyaka, together with his associate Vēṅgarāja left the Vēṅgī *viśhaya* and repaired to a Vana-durga surrounded by hundreds of mountains. They both had reconquered the Āndhra country after putting an end to the entire Turushka horse in battle (*Samarē śamit-āsēsha-Turushka-turag-ōtkarau, punar-āharatām=ētāv=Āndhrām maṅḍalam=ardhataḥ*). After killing all the Yavana commanders (*viḥat-ākḥila-Yavana-vāhini-nāthah*), Vēṅga-bhūpati went to heaven (probably was killed in battle), as if to help Indra in battle. This Vēṅga-bhūpati, great-grandson of Brahmā, grandson of Dēva and son of Kāmarāja of the Lunar dynasty, was the maternal uncle of Kāma, alias Bhaktirāja, son of Gaṅgarāja of the Solar dynasty. Consequent on the death of Vēṅga-bhūpati, probably without leaving an heir to his kingdom, Prōlaya-nāyaka installed Bhaktirāja, while he was still a boy as the ruler of his maternal uncle's territory, which seems to have comprised Vēṅgī and its surrounding tracts. Thus Chōḍa Bhaktirāja who, according to the grant referred to above, owed his elevation to the support given to him by Prōlaya-nāyaka, though a boy, killed the infantry and cavalry of the Yavana king (*Bhakti-kṣhitipālakō=*

¹ *Ep. Indo-Mos.*, 1923-1924, pp. 13 ff.

² *A Forgotten Chapter of Āndhra History*, p. 17.

³ *Nellore District Inscriptions*, Vol. III, O. 73. The Mallavaram record registers a grant of land to god Rāghava of Chadalavāḍa in the Ongole Taluk of the Guntur District in the Śaka year denoted by the chronogram *Śaila* (7), *Vārdhi* (4), and *Dyumaṇi* (12), that is, 1247, in the month of Āśvija on the occasion of a solar eclipse on Thursday (*Āśvīnasy-āvāsānē rāhu-grastē-himāṁśau Suraguru-divasē*) by Vēmā-redḍi, one of Prōlaya-nāyaka's subordinate associates, who is described in the record as "the very Agastya to the ocean, namely, Mlēcchhas (*Mlēcchh-āmbhōdhi-Kalāś-ōdbhavaḥ*). The equivalent English date is 7th October, 1325 A.D. The date Śaka 1277 given by Butterworth and Venugopala Chetty in the Nellore inscriptions by assigning the value 7 to *Vārdhi*, and the occasion as lunar eclipse (*himāṁśau*) are both wrong as pointed out by Mr. H. K. Narasimhaswami in the course of his article on the Kōḍūru grant of Anavōtā Redḍi (above, Vol. XXV, p. 139 and n. 5). He takes *himāṁśu* as *ahimāṁśu* correctly but accepts the value seven given by the authors for the term *vārdhi*. Hence he finds the date irregular as there was no solar eclipse in the month of Āśvija in Śaka 1277. So he writes, "The word *vārdhi* in the chronogram *śaila-vārdhi-dyumaṇi* as read by the authors (Butterworth and Venugopala Chetty) mentioned above has therefore to be altered suitably by some such word as *tarka* to give the numeral 6 in place of 7, and the chronogram equated with 1267." If corrected like this the date becomes regular as there was a solar eclipse in the month of Āśvija on Thursday in Śaka 1267. But the numerical value generally given to *vārdhi* is 4 and not 7. Then the Śaka date becomes 1247 and not 1277. In 1247 there was a solar eclipse in the month of Āśvija on Monday, *Śasīdhara-divasa*, and not on Thursday, *Suraguru-divasa*. The week day does not totally tally, if 1247 is taken. However this Śaka date which is given so clearly in the inscription may be accepted.

⁴ *A. R. Ep.*, 1915, No. 308.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 1946-47, App. A, No. 3.

tha bālō=’pi saṁgrāma-raṁga-saṁhṛita-yavana-ādhipa-subhaṭa-ghōṭak-ātōpaḥ), i.e. king of the Musalmans.

Prōlaya-nāyaka, son of Pōchi-nāyaka, is, no doubt, identical with his namesake of the Musunūri family, the donor of the grant under review. The Penṭapāḍu grant referred to above, not only confirms the account of the liberation of the coastal Āndhra country furnished by the grant under review, but also reveals to us the names of two of his associates, Vēnga and Bhaktirāja—the former his elder and the latter a younger contemporary—who played an important part in the war of independence, even though their achievements are unknown to us from that grant. It is probable that Pōchi-nāyaka, the father of Prōlaya-nāyaka, also lost his life during this memorable war. The unnamed *vana-durga* to which Prōla and Vēnga repaired, may be safely identified with Rēkapalli, the capital of Prōlaya-nāyaka, situated near the Mālyavanta mountain mentioned in the present grant. Nothing more is known about either Vēnga-bhūpati or his ancestors.

Some more information about the achievements of Chōḍa Bhaktirāja such as the defeat of Boggara and other Muhammadan warriors in the battle near Gulapūṇḍi, his conquest of the demoniac forces of Dabaru-khānu and others near Pedakoṇḍāpurī may be gleaned from the undated Rajahmundry Museum plates¹ of his son, Annadēva-chōḍa.

As has already been stated, the Kaluvachēru grant of Anitalli² also attests to the fact of the liberation of the Trilinga country by Prōlaya-nāyaka and of Kāpaya-nāyaka’s rule over it. This grant mentions Vēma of the Paṇṭa community, as one of the seventy-five Nāyakas that served Kāpaya-nāyaka. He was the son of Prōlaya-redḍi and the founder of the Redḍi kingdom of Koṇḍaviḍu. Vēma was thus a contemporary and loyal associate of the Musunūri chief, Kāpaya-nāyaka, and probably of his cousin and predecessor, Prōlaya-nāyaka. His Mallavaram stone record,³ dated in Śaka 1247 (October 7, 1325 A.D.), describes him as the very Agastya to the ocean, namely, Mlēcchhas (*Mlēcchh-ābdhi-Kumbhōdbhava*), and indicates the region of his activities during the period of this war. As he is stated to have re-granted the *agrahāras* to Brāhmaṇas which were formerly taken away by the Muslims, after rescuing them from the enemy, on the banks of the three important rivers, the Gautamī, the Kṛishṇā, and the Brahmakuṇḍī or Kuṇḍiprabhā, i.e. the Guṇḍlakammā, he must have participated in the war against the Muhammadans in the region through which these rivers flow. Vēma’s victory over the Yavanas, i.e. Muhammadans, the protection by him of Madhy-Āndhra-dēśa, i.e. the Middle Āndhra country, and the patronage of Brāhmaṇas, are also referred to by his court poet Yarrā-Preggaḍa in his *Harivamśam*.⁴ He loyally co-operated with the Musunūri chiefs, Prōla and Kāpa, during the early post-Kākatīya period and contributed to the success of the war of independence. It seems strange that the Kaluvachēru grant mentions Vēma as the subordinate of Kāpaya-nāyaka and not of Prōlaya-nāyaka, though his contemporaneity with the latter is indubitable. This was probably due to the fact that the administration of the country was left in the hands of Kāpaya-nāyaka by his cousin Prōla, after the conquest of the country, as has been stated in the grant under review.

This record registers, on the occasion of a lunar eclipse, the grant of Vilasa, the best of the fertile villages of the Kōna-maṇḍala on the banks of the Gōdāvarī, as an *agrahāra* to Vennaya, the elder brother of Gaṇapay-ārya and son of Annaya, grandson of Vennaya and great-grandson of Annaya of the Bhāradvāja *gōtra* and *Yajur-vēda*. The donee is described in high sounding terms as a learned scholar of note and a well-to-do person of charitable disposition. Several *yājūkas* of blemishless conduct, who had performed many sacrifices with the money given by him, are said to have shone like the flags of fame, etc. When Prōlaya-nāyaka,

¹ Above, Vol. XXVI, No. 2.

² *J.Tel.Ac.*, Vol. II, pp. 93-112; *Bhārati*, Vol. XXI, Part I, pp. 553 ff.; Part II, pp. 61 f.

³ *Nellore District Inscriptions*, Vol. III, Ongole 73.

⁴ *Harivamśam*, Part I, 5,260; Part II, 2,1,

finding Vennaya to be a *dānapātra* (i.e., a person worthy of a gift), implored him to receive the gift of a village, he accepted it out of consideration for him, in spite of his aversion to do so. After having received Vilasa as an *agrahāra*, he, along with his brother, re-granted it to a number of Brāhmaṇas, having divided it into one hundred and eight shares. There were eighty donees in all including the two deties, Gautamēśvara and Kēśava of the village. The list of donees with their names of *gōtras*, *śākhās* and the number of shares given to each is appended hereto.

This *agrahāra* was pre-eminently granted to the Bhāradvāja-gōtrins, who received more than fifty four shares in the village. With the exception of a few, most of the donees were Yajur-vēdins who were proficient in the sacrificial lore, besides being poets, commentators, *Vēd-ālhjāpakas* and *adhyētris* and experts in *śāstras* and *darśanas*. The titles given to many of the recipients indicate the high level of their scholarship and skill in the various sciences and arts. It is unusual to find so many scholars of repute among the donees mentioned in the grants of the late medieval period. It is yet strange and unfortunate that not even one of the works of these reputed scholars, who were not only proficient in *gaṇita*, *jyōtisha*, grammar, logic, *āgames*, *darśanas* and *vēdānta* but were also scholarists and poets, has come to light. It is for future research to unearth their works. It is interesting to find two donees of the Parāśara *gōtra* and Yajus *śākhā* who were experts in the *guru-tantra*. The mention of the *guru-tantra* in the grant under review shows that even *pūrva-mīmāṃsā* was studied in the coastal Āndhra country as late as the fourteenth century.

It is also worth noting that the donees, with the exception of a few, were experts in the ritual of sacrifices. This is significant as indicating the revival of Vēdism and Vēdic sacrifices in the early post-Kākatīya period in the coastal region, subsequently to the attainment of independence and the re-establishment of Hindu monarchy. The establishers of independence voluntarily undertook the task of purifying the places in Āndhra (*Āndhrān=pralēśān*) defiled by the sinful feet of the Muhammadans, by the continuous performance of Vedic sacrifices by Brāhmaṇas, which were stopped during the Mussalman rule (*kṛitvā pravṛittān virata-prasaṅgān yajñān havir-dhūma-param-parābhik*). This revival of sacrifices and Vēdism gave a re-orientation to the then existing religion of the country by giving it a strong Vēdic tinge, and had a profound influence on the Vaishṇava cult of the South.

Of the places mentioned in the grant, viz., Tiliāga-dēśa, Kōna-maṇḍala, Dhilli, Ēkaśilānagara, Rēkapalli and the gift village Vilasa and its boundaries, Tilinga-dēśa is the Telugu country. Its extent conformed more or less to the present Āndhra State. The terms Telugu and Āndhra became synonymous even by the middle of the thirteenth century and both terms were applied indiscriminately to denote the whole country dominated by the Telugu speaking people. Kōna-maṇḍala, same as Kōna-dēśa, Kōna-rāshṭra of Kōna-sthala, is the country ruled by the feudal chiefs of the Haihaya dynasty in the 12th and 13th centuries of the Christian era. It is no doubt the *Reṇḍ-ēṛula-naḍimi-vishaya* of the Nairāṇḍāmpūṇḍi grant¹ and probably the *Sindhu-yugm-āmtara-dēśa* of the Piṭhāpuram pillar inscription of the Velanāṭi king, Prithivīśvara.² The identification of the *Sindhu-yugm-āmtara-dēśa* with the territory between the rivers Gōdāvārī and the Kṛishṇā³ by Hultsch, the editor of the inscription, is of course, erroneous. According to the late Mr. J. Ramayya Pantulu who re-edited the Nairāṇḍāmpūṇḍi grant in the journal of the Telugu Academy,⁴ the terms *sindhu-yugm-āmtara* is nothing but a Sanskritisation of *reṇḍ-ēṛula-naḍimi-vishaya* of the Nairāṇḍāmpūṇḍi grant, and the rivers that enclose this territory, are the Gautamī, the main one of the seven-branches of the Gōdāvārī, and the Vainatēyam, another of its branches. So this *reṇḍ-ēṛula-naḍimi-vishaya* in his opinion, corresponds to the present Amalapur Taluk. This Kōna-sthala or Kōna-dēśa

¹ Above, Vol. IV., pp. 300, ff.

² Ibid., Vol. IV, pp. 36 and 42.

³ Ibid., p. 36.

⁴ Vol. I, pp. 45 ff.

finds mention in the Nadupūru grant of Anavēmā-reḍḍi,¹ and in the Tottaramūḍi plates of Kāṭayavēma.² This territorial division retains its name even today and the whole territory between the Vasishṭha and the Gautamī branches of the Gōdāvāri is known as Kōṇa-sīma at the present day. Dhilli is the well-known city of that name, the capital of the Indian Republic, which was the capital of the Slave kings, the Paṭhāns and the Tughluqs in the medieval period. Ēkaśilānagara is the present Warangal, the headquarters of the district of the same name in the Andhra State. Rēkapalli is identical with the village of the same name in the Bhadrachalam Taluk of the East Godavari District. Of the villages mentioned in the grant only Vilasa, the village granted and its boundary village of Śirupalle and Māṅgām are identifiable. They are in the Amalapur Taluk. Śirupalle is the present Śiripalle, and Māṅgām, the present village of Māṅgām. Vilasa, which is a few miles distant from Amalāpuram, retains its old name to the present day. The rest of the boundary villages are not to be found now.

It is stated that the grant was made on the occasion of a lunar eclipse; but neither the Śaka-year or the cyclic year nor the month in which the lunar eclipse occurred is specified. Hence the precise date of the grant cannot be definitely ascertained. However, the period in which it was given, can be approximately calculated. The grant was certainly subsequent to 1325 A.D. (Śaka 1247), the earliest date known for the establishment of Hindu independence in the coastal region. It is unfortunate that none of the records of Prōlaya-nāyaka with the exception of this grant has come to light. In this respect his brother, Kāpaya-nāyaka was really more fortunate. Besides his Prōlavaram grant³ already adverted to, dated in Śaka 1267, Pārthiva, there are two of his lithic records, the Gaṇapēsvaram inscription⁴ dated in Śaka 1268, Vyaya, and the Pillalamarri inscription⁵ dated in Śaka 1279, Hēmaḷaṅbi. Of these, his Prōlavaram grant is the earliest as is evident from its date. But the country of Tiling, in fact, the whole of Southern Hyderabad to the south of Warangal, was already in the possession of the Hindus by 1339 A.D., the date of the Bādāmi record of Harihara I,⁶ the founder of the kingdom of Vijayanagara. Hence, Kāpaya-nāyaka was surely in possession of Warangal before 1339 A.D. He conquered it probably by about 1336-37 A.D. from the Mussalmans.⁷ As the Muslim historians mention Kāpa, Kabā-nand, or Kabā-Nāyand, who is no other than Prōlaya-nāyaka's brother Kāpa Niḍu or Kāpaya-nāyaka, as the leader of the rebellion of the Hindus of Warrangal in Telaṅgāna, it seems likely that his brother Prōlaya-nāyaka was already dead by that time. If not so, he must himself have been mentioned as the leader of the rebellion. If this supposition is accepted, the record under review must have been granted between 1325 and 1336-37 A.D., possibly about 1330 A.D.

The editors of the present record take this opportunity of expressing their gratitude to Sri N. Lakshminarayana Rao, for lending for consultation the impressions of the following unpublished inscriptions: (1) the Śrīśailam epigraph of Kācheya-reḍḍi, (2) the Mallavaram inscriptions of Prōlaya Vēmā-reḍḍi, and (3) the Pentāpāḍu grant of Chōḷa Bhaktirāja. They also offer thanks to Dr. V. Raghavan, Professor of Sanskrit, University of Madras for revising the Romanised text of the inscription.

¹ Above, Vol. III p. 2

² Ibid., Vol. IV., p. 320.

³ JBORS, Vol. XX, pp. 260 ff.

⁴ SII, Vol. IV., No. 950.

⁵ *Cryp. Ins. Tel. Dist.*, p. 113, No. 40.

⁶ *Ind. Ant.* Vol. X, pp. 63 ff.

⁷ *Ind. Cult.*, Vol. V, p. 264; *A Forgotten Chapter of Andhra History*, p. 69. *The Early Muslim Expansion in South India*, p. 205.

List of Donees

Serial Number	Name of the Donee	Sākhā	Gōtra	No. of Shares
1	Dēchi-bhaṭṭa	Yajus	Kapi	2
2	Mallikūchi	"	"	1
3	Peda-Bhāvana-bhaṭṭa	"	Bhāradvāja	} 12½
4	Peda-Siddhaya-bhaṭṭa	"	"	
5	Bhadra	"	"	
6	Pina-Bhāvana-bhaṭṭa	"	"	} 12½
7	Pina-Siddhaya	"	"	
8	Mallaya	"	"	1
9	Chēmakūra Dhāmaya	"	"	1
10	Sōmayārya	"	"	1
11	Mamchi-bhaṭṭa	"	"	1
12	Kēsava	"	"	1
13	Jakkaya	"	"	1
14	Bhāskara	"	"	1
15	Pinnaya	"	"	1
16	Gaḍḍapalli Peddi-bhaṭṭa	"	"	1
17	Taittiri Viṭṭhaya	"	"	1
18	„ Appalu	"	"	1
19	„ Yajñama	"	"	1
20	Chennaya	"	"	1
21	Śrikamṭha	"	"	1½
22	Āditya	"	"	1½
23	Pammappalu	"	"	1
24	Nāgasvāmi	"	"	1
25	Siṅgaya	"	"	½
26	Siṅgaya	"	"	½
27	Nṛisimha-bhaṭṭa	"	"	1
28	Peddaya	Ṛik	"	½
29	Sōmāya-bhaṭṭa	Yajus	Kauṇḍinya	1
30	Kēsava	"	"	1
31	Pōtappaya	"	"	2
32	Siṅgappaya	"	"	2

Serial Number	Name of the Donee	Śākhā	Gōtra	No. of Shares
33	Rāmaya	Yajus	Kauṇḍinya	1
34	Mañchyappalu	"	"	$\frac{1}{2}$
35	Mañchyappalu	"	"	$\frac{1}{2}$
36	Sōmappaya	"	"	1
37	Annaya	"	"	1
38	Nārāyaṇa	"	"	1
39	Mallu-bhaṭṭa	"	"	1
40	Simhagiri	"	"	2
41	Gōvinda	"	Kāśyapa	1
42	Nāgaya	"	"	1
43	Bolli-bhaṭṭa	"	"	1
44	Rāmaya	"	"	1
45	Sūraya	"	"	1
46	Narahari	"	"	1
47	Gannaya	"	"	1
48	Sūri-bhaṭṭa	"	"	1
49	Kāmaya	Ṛik	"	1
50	Erapōta	"	"	1
51	Elukurk-Appale-bhaṭṭa	Yajus	Harita	1
52	Padmanābha	"	"	1
53	Vallabha	"	"	1
54	Trivikrama	"	"	1
55	Ananta-bhaṭṭa	Ṛik	"	1
56	Rāmaya	"	"	1
57	Īsvara	Yajus	Parāśara	1
58	Īsvara	"	"	1
59	Vēlumpalli Pōchanārya	Ṛik	Vādhūla	2
60	Nā[rā]yanappaya	"	"	1
61	Vennaya	"	Vaśishṭha	1
62	Gaṅgayārya	Yajus	"	1
63	Punnaya	Ṛik	Kauśika	1
64	Chittāya	Yajus	Gautama	1
65	Vaikunṭha-bhaṭṭa	"	Ācrēya	1

Serial Number	Name of the Donee	Śākhā	Gōtra	No. of Shares
66	Rāmāya-bhaṭṭa	Yajus	Ātrēya	1
67	Appāya-bhaṭṭa	„	Śrīvatsa	2
68	Ananta	„	„	2
69	Pōti-bhaṭṭa	„	„	1
70	Tippaya	„	„	1
71	Viśvēśvara	„	„	1
72	Chukka-boṭṭa Mallikūchi	„	„	2½
73	„ Mallayapeddaya	„	„	1½
74	Bollaya	„	Maitrēya	1
75	Kēśava	„	„	1
76	Vissaya	„	Gārgya	1
77	Taṅgeḷḷapalli Pōhana	„	Śāṅḍilya	1
78	Māraya	„	„	1
79	Kēśava (god)	„	„	1
80	Gautamēśvara (do.)	„	„	1

108

TEXT

[Metres : Verses 1, 40, 45 *Śārdūlavikrīḍita* ; verses 2, 3, 5-6, 12-13, 16-18, 21, 26, 33, 35, 39, 42, 47, 49, 53, 60, 61, 63, 64, 72-108 *Anuṣṭubh* ; verses 4, 7-11, 14-15, 19-20, 22-24, 27, 29, 31-32, 36-38, 41, 43-44, 48, 50-52, 56-58, 62, 65-71 *Upajāti* ; verses 25, 54, 55 *Āryā* ; verse 28 *Praharshinī* ; verses 30, 57 *Indravajrā* ; verse 34 *Upagīti* ; verse 46 *Rathōddhatā*.]

First Plate

- 1 Avighnam=astu | Yām prēmṇā Śasīmauḷinā Gajamukhō gāḍham samāliṅgitaś=chāpalyāch=chhaśinaḥ kalā[r̄n]
- 2 kara-talēn=ādāya mūrdhni sthitām(tām) | nikshipy=ētara-damta-sīmni samabhāt=samlakshya damta-dvaya[h̄ ka]-
- 3 lyāṇam vitanōtu sā śāśi-kalā Vighnēśvaraḥ sō=’pi vah || [1*] Puṣṭim̄ krishīṣṭa vah pōtri purāṇaḥ [Pu]-
- 4 rushōttamaḥ [|] yad-damshṭrā-hariṇāmkaśya vasudhā lāmchhanāyatē || [2*] Upātta-satvā(ttvō) bhagavā[n=ā]-
- 5 dau Nārāyaṇō vibhuh | adrākshīd=amayam̄ viśvam=unmīlan-nayan-āmbujah || [3*] Tataḥ pari[tō]

- 6 ra[ja]sā guṇēna brāhmim=upāsṛitya tanum Mahēśaḥ | akalpayat=pūrvavad=ēva lōkān=sa[r]vān
- 7 kṛip-ārdrikṛita-chitta-vṛittih || [4*] Samudra-dvīpa-saṁvītā Hēm-āchala-manōharā | sarvēshām=api
- 8 lōkānām madya(dhya)sth=ē'yam vasuṁda(dha)rā || [5*] Tasyās=cha ratna-garbhāyāḥ sarvasyā madhya-varttinam(nam) | Jam[bū]-
- 9 dvīpam vidur=dēśam lavaṇ-āmbudhi-vēshṭitam(tam) || [6*] Dvīpē='pi tasmin=navadhā vibhaktē Himāchalā¹d=dakshinam=ā-sa-
- 10 mudram(dram) | bhāgam bhuvō Bhāratavarsham=āhuḥ phalamti karmāṇi kṛitāni yatra || [7*] Bhāshā-[sa]-
- 11 māchāra-bhidā vibhinnai[r]=dēśair=anēkair=bahudhā vibhaktē | varshē cha tasmin kamanīya-vāsas=Tiliṅga-nāmā
- 12 sa chakāsti dēśaḥ || [8*] Mahardhi(rddhi)-ramyāṇi purāṇi naḍyaḥ puṇy-ōdakā ramyatarā mahīdhrāḥ | vanā[ny=a]-
- 13 sēvyānna(ny=a)talās=taṭākā durgāṇy=adhṛishyāṇi cha² samti yatra || [9*] Ēvam-vidhām=āmbudhi-mēkhalām tā-
- 14 m=apīpalan dharma-naya-kramēṇa | Sōm-āika-vamśyā narapāla-varyyāḥ purāṇa-siddhāḥ puruhūta-
- 15 bhāsaḥ || [10*]

Second Plate, First Side

- 16 Gatēshu tēshu³ kshitipālakēshu⁴ kshitīśvarāḥ Kākati-vamśa-jātāḥ | kālē Kalau samprati varttamānē Ti-
- 17 liṅgam=āsthāya śasāsaur=urvīm(rvīm) || [11*] Tēshām=Ēkaśilā-nāma-nagarī pṛithivikshitām-(tām) | Ikshvākū-
- 18 ṇa(ṇā)m=Ayōdhy=ēva ramy=ābhūt=kula-vāsa-bhūḥ || [12*] Kāla-kramāt prayātēshu tēshv=analpa parā-
- 19 kramāḥ | Pratāparudrō nṛipatiḥ pālayāmāsa mēdinīm(nīm) || [13*] Sarvē='pi dāna-pravaṇā manushyā
- 20 dvijātayō yajña-parās=samastāḥ | kalis=tad=āsīt kṛita-kāla-chihnō yasmin=mahīm śāsati
- 21 Vīra-Rudrē || [14*] Yasti(smi)n=mahīm śāsati śāsan-āmkām prajāḥ prajā⁵-pālana-karma-dakshē | n=āsmārshur=ādyā[n=na]-
- 22 rapāla-mukhyān=Yayāti-Nābhāga-Bhagīrath=ādyān || [15*] Ath=aivam śāsata tēna Tu[ru*]-shkāṇā-
- 23 m=adhīśvarāḥ | Ahammadu-Suratṛāṇō mahad=vairam samācharat || [16*] Bhūpāla-laya-Kā-

¹ The letter *tā* is inserted between *cha* and *da*.

² *Cha* is inserted below the line between the letters *ni* and *sam* with the mark of a cross above the line to indicate its place.

³ *Tēshu* is inscribed below the line with a curved line underneath and a cross mark above the line between the letters *shu* and *kshī* to indicate its place.

⁴ Between *pā* and *la* in *Kshitipāla*, a letter which looks like *ti* is erased.

⁵ *Prajā* in *prajāpālana* is inscribed below with a cross above it to mark its place.

VILASA GRANT OF PROLAYA-NAYAKA

i

2	...	2
4	...	4
6	...	6
8	...	8
10	...	10
12	...	12
14	...	14

ii, a

16	...	16
18	...	18
20	...	20
22	...	22
24	...	24
26	...	26
28	...	28

Scale : One-half

30	<p> 30 32 34 36 38 40 </p>	<p> 30 32 34 36 38 40 </p>
----	---	---

42	<p> 42 44 46 48 50 52 </p>	<p> 42 44 46 48 50 52 </p>
----	---	---

- 24 lēna yēna niśśēshatām gatāḥ | Jāmadagnyēna Rāmēṇa hata-śēshā mahībhṛitaḥ || [17*] Vīr-
ōdbhaṭa-bhaṭa-
- 25 s=sō='pi Vīra-Rudraḥ pratāpavān | ajayat=sapta-kṛitvas=tam¹ nava-laksh-āśva-sādhanam
(nam) || [18*] Nīti-praśastō=
- 26 'pi bal-ādihikō='pi sahāya-yuktō='pi cha Vīra-Rudraḥ² | bhāgya-kshatēr=mānusha-marṇḍa-
lasya Turushka-ba(bha)rtu-
- 27 va(tur=va)śatām=ayāsīt || [19*] Sa nīyamānō nagarīm svakīyām Dhillīm prayatnād=Yavan-
ēśvarēṇa | Sōmō-
- 28 dbhavāyāḥ saritaḥ³ pratīrē daivād=ayāsīt=tridaś-ādhivāsam(sam) || [20] Pratāparudra-
tigmāmśau lōk-āntara-ti-

Second Plate, Second Side

- 29 rōhitē [|] Turushk-āmdha-tamisrēṇa samākrāntam mahītalām(lam) || [21*] Pratāparudrēṇa
param parā-
- 30 stō ripūn=adharmō Yavanān gatō nu | nō chēd=gatē='smin Yavanais=sah=aiva katham nir-
ābādha-sukham
- 31 jajṛimbhē || [22*] Kēchid=dhanādhyāḥ paribādhyamānā dhanāya⁴ pāpair=vividhair=upāyaiḥ
| kēchin=nirīkshy=aiva cha Pāraśīkā-
- 32 n paryatyajan prāṇa-nabhasvatō='nyē || [23*] Dvijātayas= tyājita-karma-bandhā bhagnās=
cha dēva-pratimās=sa-
- 33 mastāḥ | vidvad-varishṭhaiś=chira-kāla-bhuktās=sarvē='py=apāhārishat=āgrahārāḥ || [24*] Āttē
karshaṇa-lābhē pā-
- 34 pair=Yyavanair=balātkārāt | dīn-ādīna-kuṭumbāḥ kṛishīvalā nāsam=āpamnāḥ || [25*] Dhana-
dār-ā-
- 35 [dikē] nṛiṇām kasmimśchid=api vastuni | sv-āyattatā-matir=n=ābhūd=bhuvī tasyām mah-
āpa-
- 36 [di] || [26*] [Pēyā] surā gō-pīśitam cha bhñō(bhō)jyam līlā-vihārō dvija-ghātanam cha | aśrām-
tam=āsīd=Yavan-ā-
- 37 dhamānām katham nu jīvēd=bhuvī jīva-lōkaḥ || [27*] Ittham tair=Yyavana-bhaṭaiḥ pra-
bādhyamānam Tailiṅgam dha-
- 38 raṇi-talam sur-āri-kalpēḥ(lpaiḥ) | trāta(tā)ram kam=api hṛid=āpy=aviṇdamānam samtēpē
vanam=iva dāva-vahni-
- 39 jushtam(śṭam) || [28*] Anāmtaram samprati yāvanīm tām=ālōkya pīdām=anukāmpamā-
naḥ | amś-āvati-
- 40 rṇō bhagavān=iv=ādyāḥ Prōla-kshītīśō vasudhām bibhartti || [29*] Puṁsaḥ pa(pu)rāṇasya
padād=udīrṇam(rṇam) va-

Third Plate, First Side

- 41 rṇam(ṇam) yam=ā[huh] Kalikāla-varyam(ryam) | tatra praśastō Musunūri-vamśō yaj-janma-
dhāma [pratha]-

¹ *Stā* originally engraved has been erased and corrected into *stā*.

² The length mark of *dra* has been cancelled by a cross mark circumscribed by a circle.

³ *Saritaḥ* is inscribed below the line with the mark of a cross above.

⁴ *Dhanā*^o is engraved below the line with a cross mark above the line to show its place.

- 42 tē pṛithivyā[m](vyām) [||] [30*] Sa Prōla-bhūpō Musunūri-vamśyas=tathā-vidham Yāva-
nam=ādhipatyam (tyam) |
- 43 viśv-ōpajīvyēna viśṛimkhalē(lē)na vyanīnaśad¹bāhu-balēna viraḥ || [31*] Nām=āśya tēshām
Yavan-ādha-
- 44 mānām maṁtraḥ kim=uchchātana-karma-kārī | dīnā yad-uchchāraṇa mātratas=tē durggāṇi
saṁtya-
- 45 jya kutō=[py]=abhūvan || [32*] Yāḥ prajās=samabādhyamta Yavanais=tām=anūpamam¹ |
prabhavamta-
- 46 m tam²=ēv=āgur=ni[dā]gh-ā[r*]ttā iva hradam(dam) || [33*] Yē pīditās=Turushkair=anāratam
mā-
- 47 nushā ghōram(ram) | tē tān=ēva nijaghnur=balam=āśrayajam mahat=khyātam (tam) [34*]
Ittham pa-
- 48 rāśya prabalam prapam³cham Yāvanam balī | nashtam=āpadi kashtāyām dharmam punar=
avivṛitat [||] [35*]
- 49 Apāhṛitāms=tair=atipāpa-chāraiḥ Prattān purāṇair=manujēmdra-varyyaiḥ | anēkaśaḥ⁴
pūrva-
- 50 ha(ma)hīsurēbhyaḥ Prōla-kshitiśō='dadat=āgrahārān || [36*] Kṛitvā pravṛittān virata-pra-
samgān ya-
- 51 jñān havir-dhūma-paramparābhīḥ | Turush[ka]-samchāraṇa-jāta-pāpān=Āmdhrān pradēsān=a-
52 naghān=akārshīt || [37*] Kṛishivalās=ch=āpi kṛishiḥ(shēḥ) phalānām yath-ōditam
bhāgam=adaḥ prabhīsh[tā]-

Third Plate, Second Side

- 53 ḥ | tapasvinash=shashtam=iva prabhāgam pṛithvī-bhujē='smai tapasaḥ phalānām(nām) ||
[38*] Yad= yat=kṛitam Pāraśī-
- 54 kaiḥ⁵r= vyatyastam dharaṇitalē | tat=tat=sarvam yathā-pūrvam vyarīrachad=ayam balī ||
[39*] Ittha-
- 55 m Prōla-mahī[dha]rēṇa balinā sarvaṁsah=ē'yam chirāt=kashtāyā Yavan-ēmdra-ghō-
- 56 ra-nikṛitēs=samṁōchya hastē dhṛitā | samtushtā sukṛit-ōpachāra-vidhibhir=vismṛitya pūrvā[n*]=
- 57 nṛipām[s=tasmi]n bhāvam=ananyagam vitanutē sausthitya-saṁdarśitam(tam)|| [40*] Tasy=
āsti tasyām bhuvi rā-
- 58 jadhānī mahībhṛitō Mālyavatas=samīpē | Gōdāvarī-prāṁta-bhuvi prasastām
- 59 yām Rēkapall=īti vadamti dāśyāḥ || [41*] Dāna-bhōg=ōpayōg[y*]ābhi[s*]=sarvūbhir=vasu-
bhūri-
- 60 bhīḥ | y=ātichakrāma nagarīma⁶m=Alakām ch=Āmarā⁷vatīm(tīm) [42*] Muktāphalair=
vidruma-bhaṁga-jāla-

¹ Read *Yavanais=tā anūpamam*.

² The letter *m* has been partly mutilated by the cutting of the ring hole and therefore looks like *v*.

³ *Prapam* in *prapamcham* is written below the line with a cross mark above.

⁴ *Ka* in *anēkaśaḥ* is written similarly below the line with a cross mark above.

⁵ The *visarga* is redundant.

⁶ The letter *ma* is redundant.

⁷ The letter *rā* is engraved below the line with a cross mark above.

- 61 kair=[maṇi]-vrajair=um̄na(na)ta-hēma-rāsibhiḥ | ṛiddh-āpaṇā yā satataṁ virājatē dhanēs-
varasy=ē-
- 62 va cha bhām̄ḍa-gēha-bhūḥ || [43*] Sa tām=adhishṭhāya purīm samṛiddhām Prōla-kshitīśaḥ
Puruhū-
- 63 [ta-tējāḥ] | apāsta-vē(vai)ri-kshitipāla-lōkām prasāsti pṛithvīm nija-sāsan-ām̄kām(kām) ||
[44*] Yad-dhātī-

Fourth Plate, First Side

- 64 shu valat-turaṁgama-khura-prōdyad-rajō-maṁḍali-vistaraiḥ paridhūsar-āla[ka]-bhara-prā-
65 m̄tā diśā-yōshi[ta*]ḥ | dṛishṭvā bhrāmtim=avāpnuvam̄ti mahatīm gam̄dharva-kanyā mu-
66 hur=bhītyā dūratarā-pradhāvad-ahita-kshm̄pāla-yōshā iti || [45*] Yat-pratāpa-tapanē-
67 na vihvalā vairiṇaḥ kshiti-bhṛitō mahīyasā | pāda-padma-nakha-cham̄dra-rōhiṇī-
68 m̄ śītalām̄ paricharam̄ti cham̄drikām̄(kām) || [46*] Yad-bāhu-pīṭham̄ samprāpya pratāp-
ōshmaḷa(la)m̄=u-
- 69 nnatam̄(tam) | tyajaty=ambudhi-sa[m̄]vāsa-klēsam̄=adya vasum̄dharā || [47*] Aratna-mauḷi-
paridam̄tu-
- 70 rēshu nirātapatr-āvaraṇēshu yasya | ājñā-naṭi nṛityati bhūpatinām̄ mūrddhā(mūrddh-ā)-
71 gra-ra[m̄*]gēshu samunnatēshu¹ || [48] Ārōpita-guṇam̄ yasya² dhanus=sāpatnya³- śam̄kayā |
ari-rā-
- 72 janya-kām̄tānām̄ kam̄ṭhasthān=alunād=guṇān || [49*] Tasy=ābhavan Kāpaya-nāyak-ā-
73 dyās=subhrātarās=śaurya-nay-ōpapam̄nāḥ(pannāḥ) | yēshu pratishṭhāpya dhuram̄ dharāyāḥ
74 prabhus=sa dharm-ārjana-tatparō=bhūt || [50*] Mahīsurēbhyaḥ Kali-kāla-varyam̄ tam̄ dā-

Fourth Plate, Second Side

- 75 na-rūpam̄ paramam̄ viditvā | prādāt=prasastān bahuśō=grahārān mahām̄-
76 ti dānāny=akarōd=bahūni || [51*] Yē sūrayas=sam̄ti mahītalē= 'smin sat=pātra-bhūtā
77 vasu bhūri tēshu | datvā(ttv=ā)tipātrē pratipādanāya vyachāyayat=ta⁴j=jagatītal-ēm̄-
78 draḥ || [52*] Bhāradvājō munīḥ pūrvam̄=abhavad=Vēda-viśrutāḥ | prathatē=nuttamam̄
gōtram̄ ya-
- 79 d-upajñam̄ mahītalē || [53*] Tad-gōtrē='nnaya-vidushaḥ pautraḥ putrās=cha Vennay-āryya-
80 sya | Annaya-nāmā vidvān=abhavata(vat) khyātō Yajur-vēdī || [54*] Vennaya-Gaṇapa-
81 ya-vibudhau tat-putrau jagati viśruta-khyātī | Yat-pāda-padma-sam̄gād=dhram̄ir=i-
82 yam̄ dhanyatām̄ dhattē || [55*] Trivishṭapād=ētya gurus=Śurāṇām̄ Pātāla-lōkātpa(t=pha)-
ṇinā-

¹ The letter *tē* is written below *shu* and its place is indicated by a cross mark in the line between *na* and *shu*.

² A circle with a cross inside is inscribed between the letters *ya* and *nya*.

³ The subscript *n* in *nya* is written on the left side of the *y* sign instead of between *t* and the *y* sign attached to it for want of space.

⁴ The letter *ta* is inscribed below the line with a cross mark above it to indicate its place.

- 83 ni patīś=cha | saubhrātra-saukhy-ānubhavāya bhūmiṃ samprāptavāntīv=iva yau vi-
 84 bhātaḥ || [56*] Jyēshthas=tayō[r*]=Vennaya-sūri-varyyaḥ prasasta-vidyā-vinay-ābhirāmaḥ |
 vistā-
 85 [ribhi]r=yyaḥ ka(ku)mud-āvadātair=yyasōbhir=āsās=surabhīkarōti || [57*] Yat-pāda-pamkēru-

Fifth Plate, First Side

- 86 ha-pārśva-namra-kshitīśvara-śrēṇi-lalāṭa-lagnā | brāhmī lipir=bhāgyavad=āspu(sphu)radbhir=
 nakh-āmśu-[jā]-
 87 lais=suvachatvam=ēti || [58*] Yatr=āsti Vidyā na cha tatra Lakshmīr=yatr=āsti Lakshmīr=na
 cha tatra Vidyā | Vi-
 88 dyā cha Lakshmīś=cha¹ vihāya vairam yasminn=ubhē tē vasataḥ prahṛishṭē || [59*] Bhōgād=
 anantaram dā-
 89 nam prasiddham prithivītalē | tyaktvā bhōgam vitaranam yasminn=ēva vijṛimbhatē || [60]
 Yad-dā-
 90 na-Lakshmī-samprāpti-budhyā(ddhyā) svar-lōka-dhēnavaḥ | ūrdhva-pādās=charamt=iva
 chiram ghō-
 91 rataram tapaḥ || [61*] Yasmād=avāptair=bahubhis=suvarṇair=anārat-ānushṭhita-yāga-
 92 tamtrāḥ | vibhānti bhūmau vimala-prachārā yaśaḥ-patākā iva yāyajū-
 93 kāḥ || [62*] Viprēbhyō vidhivad=dhēnūḥ pradatvōba(tt=ōbha)yatō²mukhīḥ | yaḥ karōti
 nijām kīrtin=nirmalā-
 94 m sarvatōmukhīm(khīm) || [63*] Yan-nisṛishṭ-āgrahārēshu pratitishṭhamti bhūsurāḥ |
 pada-vākya-pramā-
 95 najñā dharmā-stambhā iv=ōchchhritāḥ || [64*] Kṛitēshu dānēshu mahatsu yēna visvāsa-
 vibhrājita-māna
 96 sēna | chirāya dāna-pratipādakāni prayānti śāstrāṇi yath-ārtta(rttha)-bhāvam(vam) ||
 [65*] Nischitya
 97 tam Prōla-nripō=tipātram samprārṭta(rttha)yad=grāma-varam grahitum³ | prati-grahāt
 s'ō=pi nivṛitta-chētā-

Fifth Plate, Second Side

- 98 s=tat-pakshapātēna kathamchid=aichchhat || [66*] Tatō=nu-Gōdāvari tusṭa-chētā grahē
 vidhōḥ prādīśad=agrahā-
 99 ram (ram) | Kōn-āvanī-mamḍa(ṇḍa)la-sārabhūtam grāmam sa tasmai Vilas-ābhidhānam-
 (nam) || [67*] Vibhānti yasy=ā
 100 tipachēli(li)māni kshētrāṇi śāl-īkshu-vaṇō(n-ō)chitāni | ārama-bhāgās=cha bhujamga-
 vallī-rambh-ā-
 101 mra-pūgi-panas-ādi-ramyāḥ || [68*] Tam=agrahāram pratigrihya tasmāt Prōla-kshitīśād=
 atha Vennay-ā-

¹ After ś=cha the letter vi was engraved and scored off with a cross.

² The letter tō is engraved below the line.

³ The letter gra is engraved below the line. Read °tum.

- 102 ryyaḥ | sah-ānujō=ditsata bhūsurēbhyaḥ pradattayē tasya dhan-ārjanam hi || 69*]
Anēka-sāstr-ārṇa-
- 103 va-karṇa-dhārān Vēd-ādharma-san lam(samlam)ghana-jāṅghikān saḥ | prasiddha-sīl-ācharaṇ-
ābhijātyān=a
- 104 yō(yū)thayad=vipravarāmś=chirēṇa || [70*] Aisvaryya-bhōgair=yyutam=ashṭa-saṁkhyais=
tam=amkayi-
- 105 tvā nripatēs=cha nāmnā | asṭ-ōttarēṇa pravibhajya bhāgaiś=śatēna sō='dāt=sumatir
=dvijēbhyaḥ || [71*]
- 106 Ath=ātra bhāginām nāma-śākh-ādir=gōtra-vargaśaḥ | pravarnyatē samāsēna bhāga-
saṁkhyā cha
- 107 bhāginām(nām) || [72*] Sarvē=pi bhāginō=rhanti prāthamyam guṇavattamāḥ | tath-āpi
krama-vṛittitvād=vā-
- 108 chō mē n=ātra mūdhatā || [73*] Śrī || Upādhyāyō Dēchi-bhaṭṭaḥ pada-vākya-pramāṇa-vit |
Mallikūchi-
- 109 r=manishī cha Yājushau Kapi-gōtra-jau || [74*] Peda-Bhāvana-bhaṭṭaś=cha Pāṇiniś=śabda-
śāsanē | sudhīś=chulikit-āpāra-gaṁ-

Sixth Plate, First Side

- 110 -bhīra-gaṇit-ārṇavaḥ || [75*] Peda-Śi(Si)ddhaya-bhaṭṭaś=cha jyōtir-dṛishṭa-jagad-vidhaḥ |
kalit-ākhila-vāg-jālah prājñō Bha-
- 111 dra-budh-āgrāṇiḥ | [[76*] Pina-Bhāvana-bhaṭṭaś=cha vāgmī nripati-vallabhaḥ | jyōtiś-
śāstram mahad=yasya tṛitiya-
- 112 m=iva lōchanam(nam) | [[77*] Vidvaj-jana-nuta-prājñas=sabh-ārhaḥ Pina-Śi(Si)ddhayaḥ |
Mallayaś=Chēmākūr-ōpapadō
- 113 Dāmaya-kōvidaḥ | [[78*] Jyōtir-vit=Sōmay-āryyaś=cha Mamchi-bhaṭṭaś=cha Kēsavaḥ |
Jakkay-ādhyā-
- 114 pakō dhimān Bhāskaraḥ Pinnayas=sudhīḥ [[79*] Gaḍḍapallī Peddi-bhaṭṭaś=śabda-
śāstra-Patamjalih | Taittir-ō-
- 115 papad-ōpētā Viṭṭhay-Āppalu-Yajñamāḥ [[80*] Adhyāpakā(ka)ś=Chennay-ākhyas=
satat-ādhyā-
- 116 pan-ōttaraḥ | Śrīkamṭha-pada-samsēvi Śrīkamṭha-vibudh-āgrāṇiḥ [[81*] Ādityas=satyam
=ādityō pra-
- 117 hvaḥ praudha-tamō-pahaḥ | Pammappalūr-Nāgasvāmī manishī Śimgayāv=ubhau [[82*]
Nṛsim-
- 118 ha-bhaṭṭ-ōpādhāyaḥ kavir=vēdāmṭa-pāragaḥ | Yājushā ācha ēkas=tu Pedday-ādhyāpa-
- 119 k-ōttamaḥ [[83*] Shaḍ-vimśati-dvijā ētē Bhāradvāja-kul-ōdbhavāḥ | Sōmāya¹-bhaṭṭ-
ō[pā]dhyāyas=[Smṛi]ti-
- 120 jñah Kēsavas=sudhīḥ | * | [84*] Pōtappay-ādhyāpakaś=cha dharma-śāstra-kṛita-śramaḥ |
Śi(Si)mgappay-ādhyāpa-
- 121 kaś=cha śishya-saṁkrāmit-āgamah [[85*] Rāmāy-ādhyāpakō Mamchy-Appalū-Sōmappa-
yō=nnayaḥ | Nārā-

¹ The letter *ya* is written below the line, with a cross mark above to indicate its place.

* There is a floral design between the *daṇḍas*.

Sixth Plate, Second Side

- 122 yaṇ-ādhyāpakaś=cha Mallu-bhaṭṭaś=cha Yājushāḥ [| 86*] Vidvān Simhagiriś=cha dvādaśa
Kaṇḍinya-gōtrajāḥ |
- 123 Gōvind-ādhyāpakas=sādhur=Nāgay-ādhyāpakō=paraḥ [| 87*] Bolli-bhaṭṭaś=ch=āgamēshu
prauḍhō gaṇita-
- 124 marma-vit | Rāmayō Gaṇita-brahma-birudas=Sūrayas sudhīḥ [| 88*] Adhyāpakō Nara-
hariś=cha¹ Ganna-
- 125 yō=dhyāpak-ōttamaḥ | Sūri-bhaṭṭaś=cha Ya(Yā)jushi sūrā (ra) ārchau tu Kāmayāḥ
| [| 89*] Erapōt-ādhyā-
- 126 pakaś=cha daśa Kāśyapa-gōtrajāḥ | Elkurk-Appalē-bhaṭṭaḥ Padmanābhaś=cha Vallabhaḥ
| [| 90*] Trivikrama-sudhīr²=yyā
- 127 ga-tamtra-vid=Yājushā imē | Ananta-bhaṭṭō Vēdānta-śabda-śāstra-kṛita-śramaḥ [| 91*]
Kāmayō=
- 128 'dhyāpakaś=ch=ārchau Hārītāsh=shaḍ=imē dvijāḥ | Yajur³-āmbudhi-pāra-jñau Guru-
tamtra-viśāradau [| 94*]
- 129 Sudhiyāv=Īśvarāv=ētau dvau Parāśara-gōtrajau | Velu[m*]palli Pōchan-āryya[h] svādhīna⁴-
Yajur-ā-
- 130 gamaḥ [| 83*] Nā[rā*]yaṇa(ṇō)=ppayaś=ch=ārchchō(rchchau) dvau Vādhūla-kul-
ōdbhavau | s-āṅgē Bahvṛichi nishṇā-
- 131 tō Vēdē Vennaya-samjñakaḥ [| 94*] Gaṅgay-āryyō Yajus-sūrō dvau Vasishṭha-kul-ōdbha-
vau |
- 132 Puṁnnay⁵-ādhyāpakaś=ch=ārcha ēkaḥ Kauśika-gōtrajāḥ [| 95*] Yajur-nigama-nirvōdhā
Chiṭṭayō-Gau-
- 133 tam-ānvayaḥ | Kupa⁶-dvi-vidha-Mīmāṃsas=tirṇa-Vyākaraṇ-āmbudhiḥ [| 96*] Vaikumṭha-
bhaṭṭ-ōpādhyāyāḥ

Seventh Plate, First Side

- 134 kavir=adhvara-tamtra-vit | Rāmāya-bhaṭṭaś=cha Yaju[h*]-khyātāv=Ātrēya-gōtrajau |
[| 97*] Appāya-bhaṭṭ-ōpā-
- 135 dhyāyō jyōti[r*]-jñō=namta-kōvidaḥ | śabda-śāsana-vit=Pōti-bhaṭṭas=Tippaya-samj[ña]-
kaḥ | [| 98*] Vaiyāsika-ma-
- 136 ta-prauḍhaḥ ssu(su)dhīr=Viśvēśvar-ābhidaḥ | Chukka-boṭṭ=ādhi(di)kau Mallikūchi-⁷
Mallaya-Peddayau | [| 99*] Sudhiyau

¹ Read *Naraharir=Ganna*^o; *cha* is superfluous.

² The letter *dhī* is written below the line with a cross mark above to indicate its place.

³ *Ju* is written above the line with a tiny cross mark below.

⁴ The letters *svadhī* are written below the line.

⁵ Read *Punna* or *Pumna*.

⁶ Read *kṛipta*.

Chi is written below the line.

- 137 Yājushā viprās=sapta Śrīvatsa-gōtrajāḥ | Bollay-ādhyāpakō dhīmān=Kēsavaś=cha Yajur-vidau [| 100*] Maitrē-
- 138 yōttau(yau tau) Gārgya-gōtrō Yājushō Vissayas=sudhīḥ | Tamgēllapaly-abhijanaḥ Pōchan-ādhyāpak-ōttamaḥ [|101*]
- 139 Ma(Mā)rayaś=cha Yajus-śu(śū)rau dvau Śāmdilya¹-kul-ōdbhavau | Peda-Bhāvana-bhaṭṭaś=cha Peda-Siddhaya-Bhadrayau [| 102*]
- 140 Sa-pād-[ā]rddha-dvādaś-āmsās=trayas=sambhūya sōdarāḥ | tan-[mā]tra-bhāgaku dvau cha Pina-Bhāvana-Śi(Si)ddha-
- 141 yau [| 103*] Chukka-boṭṭ-ādikō Mallikūchis=s-ārddha-dvi-bhāgakaḥ | Appāya-bhaṭṭ-ōpādhyāyau(yō) jyōti-
- 142 r-jñō='namta-kōvidaḥ [| 104*] Sa Dēchi-bhaṭṭ-ōpadhyāyō Vidvān Simhagiriḥ paraḥ | adhyāpakāv=ubhau Pōta-
- 143 ppaya-Śi(Si)mgappayau dvijau [| 105*] Vēlu[m*]palli- Pōchan-āryya iti sapta-dvi-bhāgakaḥ | Mallāyapeddi-Śrikamṭh-Ādi-
- 144 tyās=s-ārddh=aika-bhāgakaḥ [| 106*] Mamchyappalū-Śimgayau cha Pedday-ādhyāpakō=py=amī | Pamch-ārddha-bhāgaka vi-
- 145 prās-śēshās=tv=ēk-aika-bhāginaḥ [| 107*] Ēk=aika-bhāgaku dēvau Gautamēśvara-Kēsavau | aśītir=ēvam=abhavan pratigraha-
- 146 yujō dvijāḥ [| 108*] Sa-grāma-dēvā(va)-bhāgās=tu jātaś=ch=āsht-ōta(tta)raṁ śataṁ(tam) || Atha sīmā-nirṇayaḥ | tū-
- 147 ṛupu-sīma Vṛid[dh]a-Gōdāvari dāṭēdi bhamḍi-rēvunan=umḍi kro[ppu]m-gāluva sīma-gānu imchika yāgnēyānaku

Seventh Plate, Second Side²

- 148 ..m=va[chchi Cheru]vādē sīmagānu vachchi amtaṭanu chāyane Māmiḍi³-kuṁṭa tūrupunaṁ-gānu tō
- 149 [mṭa]la tūrupu-kara sīmagānu paḍuva-nui (yi) mōchanu adi [āgnē]ya sīma | dakshīṇa-di-[kku]ku [paḍu-]
- 150 maṭa Bhīmavarapu-pāṭi upu[m]gāli sīma [|*] amḍun=umḍi uttarānaku veḷi Vāyavū(vyā)-nanu [a]-
- 151 vuṛu-bāḍe- puṁtan=umḍi īśām⁴nyānaku veḷanu mūṁḍu-vaṁkalanu mana
- 152 ūri mālapalli paḍumaṭi pedda-rāvi sīma [|*] amḍun=umḍi īśāmnya⁴ tīrānaku
- 153 veḷi vaṁgala-kāli dakshīṇapu pedda-chimtan=umḍi īśānya tīrānanu

¹ The *anusvāra* is engraved above the line.

² The writing on the plate especially from line 150 onwards is very indifferently engraved, probably by a different scribe.

³ The letter *ḍi* is written below the line.

⁴ The *anusvāra* is redundant.

- 154 vaṅgala-kāli dāmṭi Śirupalle-tōmṭa tūrpu-kara sīma-gānu Vṛiddha-Gau-
 155 tami dāmṭi īsām¹nya tīrānaku veḷi Śirupalle-tōmṭa dakṣiṇapu-kara-mīm̄di rā-
 156 vi sīma-gānu tīrānanu īsāmny¹ānanu Ōlēṭi-kāluva-gaṭṭu-mīm̄di² rāvi-numḍi ā-tīrā-
 157 nanē Ōlēṭi-uttarapu-gaṭṭu sīma-gānu mūm̄d-ūḷa-muttala-Māṅgāpu puṁta
 158 mōpukoni dakṣiṇānanu Vṛiddha-Guatami mōvanu || ivi sīma-saṁdhulu [||*]
 159 Prōlānēni vrālu[||*]

¹ The *anusvāra* is redundant.

² The letter *di* is written below the lines.

